2-2-2009

Minutes February 2, 2009

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
February 2, 2009

1. The regular meeting of the University Senate for February 2, 2009 was called to order by Moderator Susan Spiggle at 4:03 PM.

2. Approval of Minutes

   Moderator Spiggle presented the minutes from the regular meeting of December 8, 2008 for review.

   The minutes were approved.

3. Senator Freake presented the Report of the Senate Executive Committee.

   (Attachment #25)

   Senator Mannheim complimented the University staff responsible for weather related closing decisions, stating that they are doing a good job of selecting the days to cancel classes.

4. Senator Thorson presented materials on the proposal he presented during December 8, 2008 Senate meeting concerning potential changes to the General Education W requirement.

   (Attachment #26)

   Senator Thorson presented anecdotal accounts of his experiences and observations about undergraduate writing as well as selected statistics concerning the university's resource commitment to the current writing program in preparation for the Senate's discussion on W courses at its March meeting. He then briefly reviewed the history of writing instruction in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the general education program.

   Senator Thorson cited statistics from the recent assessment of the writing program, pointing out that 89% of students in their senior year demonstrated a moderate proficiency or less on the writing assessment. He pointed out that 55% of the courses taught—which are only moderately effective at raising students above moderate proficiency—are taught by full-time faculty. He argued that most of the writing instruction thus can be seen as remedial in nature. He stated his belief that the time of full-time faculty could be better spent in pursuits other than teaching remedial writing. His recommendation is that there must be a more effective and less expensive way to meet the W objective. Senator Thorson recommended the full Senate discuss the W requirement and then remand the issue to the proper committee(s) for further discussion and possible action.

   Senator Mannheim asked what would be the latest date by which action could be taken and have it affect next year's catalog. The response from Senator von Munkwicz-Smith was "last November."

   Senator Freake moved the W discussion be postponed until the next meeting.

   The motion carried.

5. Senator Shultz presented the report of the Graduate Tuition Waiver Task Force.

   (Attachment #27)

   Members of the Senate engaged in considerable discussion. Topics included: how the change in policy would affect the University's ability to attract graduate students; potential dollar amounts that

would be taken from grants; would the imposition of the tuition charge foster an increase in the research enterprise of the University; lack of detail on how the generated income would be used; full vs. half teaching assistantships; and inequities that will result due to the way the University will charge tuition constituting a surcharge on students who are funded by grants that allow it. Senator Schultz noted that all faculty members of the Task Force were opposed to the introduction of graduate tuition charges on grants.

Senator Freake moved to refer the report to the Senate Budget Committee.

The motion carried.

6. Report of the President

President Hogan stated that we will not have a clear notion of what is happening with our state appropriation until April or even later. He said that last fall he was told that we should anticipate a further 10% rescission in our budget (which could be considered to be a 13% total carry forward if one includes the 3% rescission already effected). President Hogan has been meeting with state legislators regularly about the state of the university and he praised the efforts of the administrative staff to generate a positive message about the university. He said that lately there have been some encouraging signs that we might not face a 10% rescission, that it might be only an additional 5%. That would amount to a 9.4% shortfall for fiscal 2010 over previous projections. This would represent a gap from the real to the projected budget of about $34.6M. He reiterated that he does not yet know what the Governor will say in her budget message soon to be delivered.

President Hogan presented basic facts concerning the consequences of a 5% rescission. He thanked the members of the CORE committee for its hard work in coming up with a list of potential revenue enhancements and cost reductions that amount to about a $7M savings. This still, however, leaves a gap of $27M. To bring our budget into balance we will have to look to further spending reductions and tuition increases--assuming we are allowed to increase tuition at all. The Provost has asked Deans to devise plans to accommodate a 3%, a 5% or a 10% rescission. Even a 3% rescission would mean lay-offs at the university. Indeed such a rescission would mean about 160 lay-offs across the university. Our first priority should be to protect as many positions as possible. President Hogan expects that this budget crisis will continue. State revenues are down 24% and we may see as much as a 40% reduction in state revenues by the close of the year.

President Hogan noted that some have asked about wage freezes. He reported that he has met with the leadership of the unions concerning this but the situation is not completely clear yet. A wage freeze would help but would not do the whole job.

President Hogan then turned his remarks to the University of Connecticut Health Center and the John Dempsey Hospital. The units constitute one-half of our operating budget and one-half of our research funding. They are inextricably intertwined with the university's program at Storrs and the regional campuses. The budget deficit at the Health Center is now $17 million and could rise to $22 to $24 million. Administrators there are preparing for 30 to 80 layoffs at the Health Center by the next fiscal year. Without wholesale closings of various large units of the hospital there is no way to get to breakeven. Such closings would have deleterious effects on the medical and dental schools at exactly a time when the state is facing a real shortage in physicians and dentists. We are the largest provider of physicians and dentists to the State of Connecticut.

The President announced the University is very close to a partnership agreement with Hartford Hospital that would create a university hospital with two campuses, one at Farmington and one in Hartford. This would move the University from a very small medical school hospital to a much larger more effective and efficient unit. The reports outlining this plan will be presented to Legislators. The cost to the state would be the cost of a new 250 bed hospital, over $475 million, plus some fringe benefit help, a total of about $500M. Under this plan the annual cost to the state (through bond service) would be about $40 million. Hartford Hospital will give the University between $5 and $7 million per year for the privilege of participating in this partnership, plus a share of any profits above $3 million. In the current economy such a profit is unlikely but Hartford Hospital will also assume all the future financial risk for the operation. They will also invest directly in future programs.

The President stated that he doesn't yet know how this will play with the Legislature; he finds that everyone to whom we make a presentation is enchanted by the vision of this but is also worried about where the State will get the money. He stated the structural deficit simply must be repaired or eventually the hospital will close and the implications of that for the Medical School and research enterprise will be severe. For the first time now we have support from all the hospitals in the state save one in pressing forward our initiatives. Senator Lowe complimented the President on the remarkable accomplishment of getting all these players together and asked if there is any chance that St Francis Hospital also will become involved. President Hogan replied that he was not optimistic that they will and in any case he doesn't believe that they can afford a partnership with us at this time even if they were willing.

7. Vice President Evanovich presented the Annual report on Financial Aid and Retention.
(Attachment #28)

8. Senator von Munkwitz-Smith presented the Report of the Nominating Committee.
(Attachment #29)

   1. We move the following faculty deletion from the named standing committee:

      Cora Lynn Deibler from the Student Welfare Committee

   2. We move the appoint Cora Lynn Deibler to Chair the Diversity Committee effective immediately through June 30, 2009.

      Items 1 and 2 were presented as one motion.

      The motion carried.

   3. We move to the following faculty and staff additions to the Diversity Committee effective immediately through June 30, 2009:

      Karen Bresciano as representative from the Growth & Development Committee
      Anne Hiskes
      Donna Korbel
      Joan Letendre as representative from the Student Welfare Committee
      Sue Lipsky as representative from the University Budget Committee
      Cathleen Love

Margo Machida
Maria Martinez
Dana McGee as an ex-officio, non-voting representative of the President's Office
Sally Neal
Elizabeth Omara-Otunnu
Isaac Ortega as representative from the Curricula & Courses Committee
Mayté C. Pérez-Franco
Catherine Ross
Gaye Tuchman as representative from the Faculty Standards Committee
Susana Ulloa as representative from the Enrollment Committee
Steven Zinn

The names within items 3 were presented as one motion.

The motion carried.

4. We move the following student deletions from the named committees:
   Krista D'Amelio, undergraduate, from the Growth & Development Committee
   Christopher Ferraro, undergraduate, from the Budget Committee

5. We move the following student additions to the named committees:

   Wonchi Ju, undergraduate, to the Diversity Committee
   Janna Mahfoud, graduate, to the Diversity Committee
   Clive Donald Richards, undergraduate, to the Budget Committee

Items 4 and 5 were presented as one motion.

The motion carried.

9. Senator Clausen presented the Annual Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee.
(Attachment #30)

10. Senator Lillo-Martin presented the Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee
(Attachments #31, 32 & 33)

1. Motion on New Wording of Appendix A in the Student Code

   Background
   The definition of Academic Integrity included in Appendix A of The Student Code was adopted from the Graduate School. SSSC proposes to replace this definition with the following statement to underscore the importance of academic integrity in undergraduate education.

   Current Wording
   Cheating - Student Academic Misconduct
   Academic misconduct is dishonest or unethical academic behavior that includes, but is not limited, to misrepresenting mastery in an academic area (e.g., cheating), intentionally or knowingly failing to properly credit information, research or ideas to their rightful originators or representing such information, research or ideas as your own (e.g., plagiarism).

Motion

To adopt the following statement and recommend that it replace the current definition of Cheating in the Student Code.

Academic Integrity in Undergraduate Education and Research

This part of *The Student Code* describes the types of acts that shall be considered academic misconduct by undergraduates, and it presents the process for imposing sanctions for such acts.

The procedures for investigating complaints and imposing sanctions for academic misconduct differ somewhat from those applied to other violations of *The Student Code.* However, a hearing on academic misconduct follows the general procedures set forth in Part IV of *The Student Code*.

A. Academic Integrity

A fundamental tenet of all educational communities is academic honesty; academic work depends upon respect for and acknowledgement of the research, ideas and intellectual property of others. When we express our ideas in class assignments, projects or exams, we need to trust that someone else will not take credit for them. Similarly, others need to trust that our words, data and ideas are our own. We find the intellectual property of others in textbooks, periodicals, newspapers, journals, solution manuals, dissertation abstracts, emails, the internet and other sources electronic or otherwise. Regardless of where we find information, protecting and acknowledging the rightful originators of intellectual property is vital to academic integrity.

B. Academic Misconduct

Academic misconduct includes but is not limited to intentionally or knowingly failing to properly credit information, research or ideas to their rightful originators or representing such information, research or ideas as your own. Knowing what constitutes academic misconduct is so important to an educational community that all students are encouraged to go to their advisors, instructors, counselors, or assistant deans of students whenever they need clarification. Students who commit acts of misconduct will be held accountable for the violation and will be subject to the sanctions and other remedies described in *The Student Code*.

C. Examples of Academic Misconduct

The following examples of academic misconduct are illustrative rather than inclusive; therefore, this is not an exhaustive list:

Complicity - Helping or attempting to help another student commit an act of academic misconduct.

Cheating – Attempting to deceive by misrepresenting mastery in an academic area. This includes but is not limited to:

●Copying answers, text, or other information from exams, assignments, solutions manuals, publications, web sites, or other sources and presenting it/them as your own;

●Participating in unauthorized collaborations on labs, homework, take-home exams, etc.;

●Use or attempted use of any resources or devices that have not been approved by the instructor. These may include the unauthorized use of books, literature, notes, study aids, calculators, conversations, emails, earphones, PDAs, cell phones, pagers, cameras, or other means that are not authorized by the instructor on exams, homework, projects, and other assignments.

●Using the data or ideas of others from archived assignments from past courses, paper-writing services, or soliciting others to carry out an assignment on your behalf and presenting it as your

own without authorization by the instructor and/or without fully acknowledging the rightful originator.

Fabrication – Using invented data or information or falsifying research or other findings; this includes but is not limited to:
●Creating a false citation or acknowledgement of a direct or secondary source;
●Intentionally documenting a source incorrectly;
●Padding the bibliography; that is, including in a bibliography or other list of references a citation that was not used to prepare the assignment;
●Including any invented and/or manipulated data or information;
●Deleting or distorting data or information in such a way as to skew its interpretation or conceal its origin;
●Submitting an assignment (or parts thereof) prepared by another without attribution.

Plagiarism - Presenting as one's own the published or unpublished ideas, data, words, or works of another that includes but is not limited to:
●Failing to properly attribute or acknowledge reproduced text or dialogue;
●Paraphrasing text or dialogue of another without proper attribution;
●Failing to provide complete and accurate recognition for the ideas, opinions, theories and other intellectual matter taken from others;
●Using data, facts, and/or other information that falls outside of the realm of common knowledge without proper attribution in the form of direct credit, footnotes, end notes or bibliography.

Other Examples of Academic Misconduct or Dishonesty include but are not limited to:
●Attempting to improperly influence any member of the university community via gifting, bribery, threats or other means;
●Presenting the same or substantially the same assignment without the authorization or knowledge of the instructor(s) in order to receive credit in two or more courses or academic areas;
●Falsifying the endorsement or approval of any member of the university community or the greater academic community;
●Altering, without authorization, an assignment, examination, grade, transcript, computer file, etc;
●Conducting unauthorized academic work for which another person will receive credit or be evaluated;
●Attempting to gain or gaining unauthorized access to restricted course resources;
●Selling or distributing restricted course resources;
●Misrepresenting your participation in a course;

Portions of this document been adapted from the web resources of:
►Princeton University Trustees, "Academic Integrity at Princeton", 2003: http://www.princeton.edu/pr/pub/integrity/
►University of Delaware Code of Conduct: http://www.udel.edu/judicialaffairs/ai.html
►University of Maryland Student Honor Council: http://www.testudo.umd.edu/soc/dishonesty.html

The motion carried.

2. Motion regarding a Statement of Class Activities During Religious Holidays

Background

It is often difficult for students when exams and other in-class activities are scheduled on religious holidays. However, it is not practical to ask instructors to avoid scheduling activities on religious holidays, as a full list of such holidays would exclude almost all class times. Therefore, the SSC recommends that instructors be urged to make reasonable accommodations for missed work.

A similar statement is issued regarding class activities missed due to university-sanctioned extracurricular / co-curricular activities. This proposal has a different basis but a similar appeal to instructors for their reasonable accommodations.

Motion

The Senate recommends that the Provost send the following message to Deans, Directors, Department Heads, Faculty and Staff prior to the start of each semester.

Statement on class activities during religious holidays

Instructors are strongly encouraged to make reasonable accommodations in response to student requests to complete work missed by absence resulting from observation of religious holidays. Such accommodations should be made in ways that do not dilute or preclude the requirements or learning outcomes for the course. Students anticipating such a conflict should inform their instructor in writing within the first three weeks of the semester, and prior to the anticipated absence, and should take the initiative to work out with the instructor a schedule for making up missed work.

Senator Strausbaugh suggested strengthening the language requiring students to be more pro-active and more responsible in preparing for these absences by substituting the word "must" for the word "should" in the statement "and ~~should~~ must inform their instructor" and ~~"should~~ must take the initiative to wok out with the instructor. . . " Discussion ensued. The amendment passed without dissent. The main motion as amended carried.

Senator Lillo-Martin presented a motion from the Scholastic Standards Committee concerning the period during which students may make up work to change grades of I,X,N and Y.

The motion carried.

3. Presentation of Completion of Incomplete Grades Proposal for Vote at the March 2, 2009 Senate meeting.

Background

- In November 2007 the Senate passed a motion presented by the Scholastic Standards Committee to change the bylaws (II.E.6) to remove the words "in which they are enrolled" from the section on "Grades of Incomplete and Absent". See item #9 in minutes and attachment #18: http://senate.uconn.edu/SenMin/senmin.20071112.pdf

  The approved change to the bylaws relates only to II.E.6. Unfortunately, section II.E.3. also refers to "the subsequent semester in which a student is enrolled." The words "next semester" should replace the phrase, "subsequent semester in which a student is enrolled".

- The same section of the by-laws also includes reference to bracketing of the GPA on student transcripts when temporary grades are assigned. This practice is no longer followed and so the wording should be deleted.

Motion
By-laws section II.E.3 shall be changed as follows:
(Deleted items in ~~strikethrough~~; new language in **bold)**

3. Undergraduate Grades
Undergraduate grading shall be done according to a letter system in which A and A- shall represent excellent work; B+, B, and B-, very good to good; C+, C, and C-, average to fair; D+, D, and D-, poor to merely passing; F, failure; I for incomplete; X for absent from semester examination (see II.E.6 below); AUD for course auditors (see II.B.6). With the approval of the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee, courses may be graded S to represent satisfactory work or U, unsatisfactory work. These courses may or may not award credit, but in neither case will grade points be awarded. With the approval of the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee, courses may be graded Y to identify non-semester related courses. When such a course is completed, a standard letter grade will replace the Y grade. If the course is not completed, the assignment of a semester grade shall be at the discretion of the instructor and the dean of the student's school or college. The letter N is used when an instructor does not submit a grade for a particular student. Temporary grades I, X, N, Y shall not suppress the calculation of either the semester or the cumulative grade point average; ~~however in such cases, the grade point average will be bracketed on the academic record.~~

N and Y temporary grades are replaced on the academic record by the actual grade when submitted by the instructor. Work to convert I, N, X temporary grades to permanent grades must be completed by the end of the third week of the **next semester** ~~subsequent semester in which a student is enrolled.~~ An N grade which remains unresolved will become N F and be computed as an F. If no grade is submitted for a grade of X, the grade will automatically revert to F and will be shown as X F.

If no grade is submitted to replace the grade of I, the automatic F will be shown as I F.

The following grade points per credit shall be assigned to grades: A, 4.0; A-, 3.7; B+, 3.3; B, 3.0; B-, 2.7; C+, 2.3; C, 2.0; C-, 1.7; D+, 1.3; D, 1.0; D-, 0.7; F, 0.

No student who has failed in a course shall have further opportunity to receive credit in that course except by repeating the work.

In all non-credit courses students shall be reported as passed "P" or failed "F".

11. Senator Hussein presented the Report of the Faculty Standards Committee.

(Attachment #34)

The Faculty Standards Committee moves to include patents in the PTR form as shown in red:

B. SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS (including art exhibits, musical compositions, and/or dramatic productions). All listed items should be in reverse chronological order.

1. Briefly (suggested length 300-500 words) outline your scholarly/creative goals for the next 5 to 10 years and the activities you have initiated to achieve them.

2. Scholarly/Creative Record. Provide full citations of your ***published*** work in the standard entry form used in your field for the categories listed below. Each citation should include a complete list of authors and pagination. (*Do not include work in progress, submitted for publication, or in press*).

a. Books, Monographs
b. Book Chapters
c. Textbooks
d. Refereed Journal Articles
e. Conference Proceedings
- Full length papers
- Abstracts

f. Miscellaneous Publications (including reviews, technical articles, and non-refereed journal articles)
g. Exhibits, Performances, Curatorial Activity
h. Awarded Patents

3. List published reviews of your scholarly work or creative accomplishments. (If available, attach copies as an appropriately labeled Appendix.)

4. List unpublished or unreleased work (including where it was submitted/accepted).
a. Now accepted or in press (attach acceptance letter as an appropriately labeled Appendix).
b. Submitted for publication or dissemination (with date of submission).
c. Pending Patents

5. List creative works or manuscripts currently under preparation. (If you wish work in progress to be part of your evaluation, tangible evidence of the work must be made available for review. Provide this as an appropriately labeled Appendix.)

The motion carried.

12. Senator Darre presented the Report of the Curricula and Courses Committee.

(Attachment #35)

I. The Curricula and Courses Committee presents the following motion to REVISE membership and voting rights on the General Education Oversight Committee in section II.C.2.d. - Oversight and Implementation of the General Education Requirements.

BACKGROUND:
The General Education Guidelines currently specify that the "Directors of the University W and Q Centers will also be given non-voting appointments to GEOC." The GEOC agrees that W and Q Center representation on the GEOC is important but argues that it need not always be the Director who must serve, but the Associate Director could serve in his/her place. The GEOC therefore recommends to change the language of the Guidelines to include Associate Directors of the W and Q Centers when the Directors of those Centers do not serve. It is understood that the W and Q Centers shall have ONE appointment each of either the Director OR the Associate Director.

According to the General Education Guidelines, W and Q Center Directors serve on the GEOC as non-voting ex-officio members. All other members, all of them co-chairs of GEOC subcommittees, are voting members. Whenever a W or Q Center representative is also co-chair of the respective GEOC subcommittee, s/he may currently not vote. This creates inequity among subcommittee co-chairs. The GEOC recommends the General Education Guidelines to be revised to allow W and Q Center representatives (the Directors or Associate Directors as outlined above), when they serve as co-chairs of a GEOC subcommittee, to retain voting rights. This change supports equity among GEOC subcommittee chairs and allows representatives of the Q or W Centers to vote in GEOC on matters discussed in their subcommittees and brought forth by these subcommittees to GEOC. When W and Q Center Directors or Associate Directors are not subcommittee chairs, they shall not have voting rights on the GEOC.

MOTION:
(Additions are in boldface):

d. *Oversight and Implementation*
"General Education Requirements will be overseen by a General Education Oversight Committee (GEOC), a faculty group appointed by the Senate and representative of the Schools and Colleges. The Committee also will have an undergraduate and graduate student representative. The GEOC shall be a subcommittee of the Senate Curricula and Courses\ Committee whose chair will serve as a non-voting member of GEOC. ~~The Directors of the University W and Q Centers will also be given non-voting appointments to GEOC.~~ **Representatives, either the Director or the Associate Director, of each of the W and Q Centers, will also be given non-voting appointments to GEOC. When Q or W Center Directors or Associate Directors are GEOC subcommittee chairs, they shall retain voting rights in the GEOC.** The GEOC will monitor the General Education curriculum. The creation of a Senate-appointed committee recognizes the policy control of the Senate in matters relating to undergraduate education. This Committee will work in association with the Office of Undergraduate Education and Instruction because this office has University-wide responsibility for the health of undergraduate education and the fiscal resources to address emerging issues. Financial support for the activity of the GEOC will come from the Office of the Provost."

A motion to amend the wording to include "and are members of the University faculty" before "they shall retain."

The motion to amend carried.

The motion, as amended, reads:

d. *Oversight and Implementation*
"General Education Requirements will be overseen by a General Education Oversight Committee (GEOC), a faculty group appointed by the Senate and representative of the Schools and Colleges. The Committee also will have an undergraduate and graduate student representative. The GEOC shall be a subcommittee of the Senate Curricula and Courses\ Committee whose chair will serve as a non-voting member of GEOC. ~~The Directors of the University W and Q Centers will also be given non-voting appointments to GEOC.~~ **Representatives, either the Director or the Associate Director, of each of the W and Q Centers, will also be given non-voting appointments to GEOC. When Q or W Center Directors or Associate Directors are GEOC subcommittee chairs, and are members of the University faculty, they shall retain voting rights in the GEOC.** The GEOC will monitor the General Education curriculum. The creation of a Senate-appointed

committee recognizes the policy control of the Senate in matters relating to undergraduate education. This Committee will work in association with the Office of Undergraduate Education and Instruction because this office has University-wide responsibility for the health of undergraduate education and the fiscal resources to address emerging issues. Financial support for the activity of the GEOC will come from the Office of the Provost."

The main motion as amended carried.

13. There was a motion to adjourn.

The motion was approved by a standing vote of the Senate.

The meeting adjourned at 6:19 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert F. Miller
Professor of Music
Secretary of the University Senate

The following members and alternates were absent from the February 2, 2009 meeting:

Albini, Lia
Becker, Loftus
Boyer, Mark
Bramble, Pamela
Breen, Margaret
Brown, Scott
Bull, Nancy
Burrill, Matthew
D'Alleva, Anne
Engel, Gerald
Franklin, Brinley
Gray, Richard
Holzworth, R.J.
Hoskin, Robert
Jordan, Eric
Kelly, Kristin
McHardy, Robert Ryan
Papadimitrakopoulos, F.
Paul, Jeremy
Rubio, Maria
Rummel, Jeffrey
Schaefer, Carl
Stwalley, William
Trumbo, Stephen
VanHeest, Jaci
Wagner, David
Zaritheny, Meredith

Report of the Senate Executive Committee
to the University Senate
February 2, 2009

The Senate Executive Committee has met twice since the December 8th meeting of the University Senate.

On January 23rd the Senate Executive Committee met in closed session with Provost Nicholls. Afterwards the SEC met with the Chairs of the Standing Committees to plan for the agenda of this meeting and to coordinate the activities between the committees. Among the items discussed were consulting and compliance policies and procedures, the budget situation and the population of the new Diversity Committee.

SEC members Anne Hiskes, Susan Spiggle and Pam Bramble, who constitute the organizing committee for this year's Trustee, Administration, Faculty and Student (TAFS) meeting presented plans for this year's meeting that will be held after the Board of Trustees meeting in February. The discussion will focus on "Learning from History: Higher Education and Society in Challenging Economic Times."

On January 30th the Senate Executive Committee met in closed session with President Hogan. Afterwards the SEC met with Administrators. The budget continued to be a central focus, including the suggestions arising from the CORE committee. The President also outlined the current status of negotiations with Hartford Hospital over the future of the University of Connecticut Health Center. Other items discussed included commencement and the academic calendar, the current state of the building program, admissions activities and the decision making process around responses to bad weather.

Following the meeting with Administrators, members of the SEC met with Lawrence Gramling, the Senate's representative to the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics to discuss the activities of that group.

Spring constituency elections are currently underway. Please vote.

Respectfully submitted,
Hedley Freake
Chair, Senate Executive Committee
February 2, 2009

Thoughts on W Courses (Robert M. Thorson, January 29, 2009)

PURPOSE: I have no personal or professional stake in this issue beyond wanting students to write well and the university to save money without compromising its academic program. I have never taught a W course.

DEFINITION: Quoting Tom Deans, Director of the Writing Center and author of the 2008 W Course Assessment Report, writing is "less a set of discrete skills" than a "complex, context-sensitive mode of learning, communicating, and doing." Given this definition, I believe that writing should be part of all courses to the degree warranted.

REMEDIAL EDUCATION: Students who need help with basic writing after first-year English are responsible for seeking that help, and the university is responsible to provide it. Faculty in cognate disciplines should not be required to remediate basic skills. Yet this is precisely what takes place in my own courses and in hundreds of others. Quoting the assessment report, "That so few papers were rated unsatisfactory is likely a consequence of policies that keep W course size small, allowing ample student-faculty interaction, and that require revision, prompting faculty to get involved early in each student's writing process." Translation? Faculty are spending lots of time teaching writing. This would be fine, were it not the fact that, "the overall quality score for 83% of the [128] papers …collected for this study… fell between 'minimally proficient' and 'moderately proficient…" and "…the evaluators did not find evidence that seniors are writing better papers than sophomores or juniors." Translation? Based on the studied sample, "ample student-faculty interaction," resulted in marginal proficiency and little change. There must be a better way.

COST: Salaried, full-time faculty holding the rank of full, associate, and assistant professor teach more than half (54.8 %) of all W course credit hours within the entire university system. Full professors (19.4) teach nearly as many W credits as assistant professors (20.7), and significantly more than associate professors (14.7). The total credit load of W courses for full professors exceeds that of both adjuncts (19.2) and graduate assistants (18.6). The teaching of writing by senior faculty within cognate disciplines is fully justified when done above the remedial level and within he student major. What constitutes good writing for the *New Yorker*, a legal brief, a case history, or a journal article is best understood by those with discipline-specific experience and with an incentive to place their students in good jobs. Cost becomes a problem only when the students aren't yet ready for that level of focus and refinement.

RECOMMENDATION: I urge the full University Senate to take up this matter and remand it to the appropriate committee or task force. Many of my colleagues in this room know far more about this problem than I. They are very willing to help.

Sources: Quotes are from the 2008 W Course Assessment Report, prepared for the General Education Oversight Committee, and composed by Tom Deans. Numerical Data on faculty W course loads for Fall 2007-Spring 2008 from Pamela Roelfs, director of the Office of Institutional Research.

TO: Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Robert M. Thorson, Professor of Geology

RE: The W-requirement and Cost Savings

DATE: January 19, 2009.

At the last Senate meeting on December 8, 2008, I was delighted to hear a clear majority of members vote to have a full and open discussion on the efficacy of W courses and the potential for cost savings by eliminating some or all with a moratorium.

I agree with Vice Provost Veronica Makowsky's suggestion that some background information needs to be assembled and shared in order to have a productive discussion. I'm in the process of gathering that information now and offer to share it with the senate via a short oral presentation of the salient facts, accompanied by a handout. Jeff von Munkwitz-Smith has offered to present briefly as well.

I also agree with Senator Karla Fox's suggestion that the subject be referred to a committee, but only after the full senate has had a chance to discuss it. It was clear to me that many senate members are starved for such an open discussion, notwithstanding the fact that the mechanistic process we usually follow is quite effective.

Please advise me if there is room on the agenda for this at the February meeting, and if so, what I can do to help. To that end, I attach an anecdotal text that lays out my rationale for putting a moratorium on W courses between first year English and the department capstone requirement. My bias is simply to mention this subject at the February Senate meeting, hand out whatever information is available, and save the discussion for the March meeting, when we can devote the time the subject deserves.

Thoughts on W Courses for Senate Consideration

Robert M. Thorson, January 19, 2009.

Impulse. This is not a pet project of mine. Rather, it was in impulsive act, prompted by the logical request of Senator Darre (Chair, Senate C&C committee) for approval of something that sounded illogical to me -- the Senate has jurisdiction over the W component of a course they have no jurisdiction over.

Credential. As someone who has encountered "publish or perish" in technical literature, the book trade, and as a journalist, I have earned my writing credentials the hard way, which I believe is the only way, one we should model for our students. Work. I was a poor writer when I entered college. Freshman English helped me become marginally proficient. Any later improvement came about because I had no alternative: I either had to become proficient or leave academia. Help, of course, was available, but the responsibility was entirely mine.

The Gist in Three Parts. I believe that: writing is the single most important skill that a university graduate should possess; that the W course model is the wrong way to achieve this objective; and that the teaching of remedial writing by permanent faculty is financially wasteful.

Commingled Problems: (1) *Responsibility*: deciding who should teach writing competence in a world that seems to value it less and less; (2) *Proficiency*: ensuring that nobody graduates from the university without having demonstrated a competency; and (3) *Pedagogy*: the method of instruction.

Aside from parents, the main responsibility for teaching writing lies with the K-12 curriculum. We should not admit a student who cannot write, which is why I am pleased with the idea of a written portion of the SAT test. The K-12 curriculum must rise to the level we set, rather than forcing us to descend to the level they graduate.

I don't know of a single professor who doubts that colleges and universities have the responsibility to upgrade the reading/writing skills beyond what high schools can do. This is what first-year English is all about: the ability to read carefully and write clearly. A student who lacks these twin skills is vulnerable to failure.

Nor have I met a professor who doesn't believe that a graduating student must have exposure to discipline-specific writing skills. What constitutes good writing for the *New Yorker*, a legal brief, and a laboratory protocol is best understood by professors in the cognate disciplines, all of whom have an incentive to place their students in jobs. Hence, having a capstone writing requirement in an academic department is completely justified. This is not about certifying that the student has met some competency (as with a Q course). Nor is it about or exposing them to something they should be exposed to (as with the GEOC distribution requirements. Rather, it is an instituted responsibility to provide the students the writing skills they will need for whatever genre, style, purpose, or market their future jobs will require.

The Q-W Contrast: … is particularly revealing. For the most part, Q courses don't teach math. Instead, they are courses where competence in mathematics (algebra, trigonometry, and analytical geometry) is required to comprehend the material and pass the course. The university must provide the help needed, and does so in the help-center model with the Q Center. But the responsibility for getting that help is that of the student. With W courses, however professors with no training in the teaching of writing are required to teach it, and to devote considerable time toward raising competence in a basic skill that first year English was supposed to have ensured. In other words, we are using discipline specific core faculty for remedial education.

Three Perspectives: From my *professorial perspective* about half of my upper division students passed through first year English without gaining the required the set of skills. I see this every year because my major course (Geol 3020: Earth Surface Processes, required for all Environmental Science, Earth Science Education, and Geoscience majors) requires a journal article, an open-ended essay, a portfolio of lab and field experiences, an abstract for a symposium, and a journal. They write more in this non-W course than in some W courses, and much of my time is spent helping students write, by which I mean those students who seek my help.

From the *student perspective*, undergraduates who gained the skills in first year English are either penalized by boredom while working on writing in W courses, or are under-challenged. I know of one political science student who was a good writer all along who said she took seven W courses instead of the three she needed because the content she wanted just happened to be designated W. She spent much of her time in busy work.

Another problem involves commingling a skill called writing and content called knowledge. In some cases, good skill is mixed with good content. But good skill can be mixed with bad content; bad skill with good content; and bad skill with bad content. A student who struggles with writing, for example, may dislike ecology if that's where she had writing instruction. Conversely, a student who loves ecology might learn to dislike writing because it detracted from the course.

From the *advising perspective*, there's the labyrinth of requirements leading to graduation. For at least 20 years I have watched panicked students try to meet the W requirement in their last semester. Many end up taking courses they don't want and bypassing ones they do want in order to get that precious W, even when they're writing is fine. In fact, if we were to drop the W requirement, I suspect that our rankings in *U.S. News and World Reports* would rise because more students would graduate in 4 years, and the faculty taking the time to teach remedial writing would be more productively engaged elsewhere, like getting grants or serving on national committees.

Bottom Line: I have never taught a W course because nobody has forced me to. Writing is too important to be parceled out here and there. I believe that when a professor creates a good course, they know what mix of W, Q, and other skills are needed, and then weave them into the course as necessary. Erecting a scaffolding of rules and a university-wide bureaucracy to manage W courses is the wrong way to go. Besides, it cost's too much.

Report of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Impact of Charging Graduate Tuition on Grants

I. Summary

Using the best available information, we estimate that about $2.5 million in new revenue could be acquired, and a reduction of 25% in the number of research assistants could result, if the tuition waiver for graduate research assistants is eliminated. This estimate takes into account the fact that some major granting agencies do not allow tuition charges, and that there are maximum funding levels (caps) at some agencies that do allow tuition charges. The estimate of realized new revenue is generous; it is biased high to an unknown degree because it is not possible to account for how the tuition waiver affects the incentive to support graduate students on grants.

Many, if not most, major universities charge at least a portion of in-state tuition to grants. Comparing the expense of supporting graduate students on grants among institutions that are ranked in the top 25 reveals that at present, with the tuition waiver, the University of Connecticut is close to the median. Elimination of the tuition waiver would make the University of Connecticut one of the most expensive institutions for support of graduate students on grants.

Eliminating the tuition waiver could have multiple repercussions on academic programs. Incentive to support graduate students would shift in favor of supporting other personnel, such as postdoctoral associates. A decrease in the total number of graduate students at the university could negatively affect research productivity and competitiveness, and could adversely affect some worthy graduate programs. Increases in the degree to which graduate programs rely on teaching assistantships for support would have a negative effect on graduate research productivity.

A survey of University of Connecticut faculty indicated widespread opposition to eliminating the tuition waiver. The survey indicates the expectation that there would be reduced graduate support on grants, and reduced availability of grant funds for other research expenses.

If the tuition waiver is to be eliminated, a policy of levying a fixed proportion of full-time, in-state graduate tuition is preferred over other possible policies. Imposition of GRA tuition and fees charges on grants must be flexible and should include a review and appeals process for retention of the tuition waiver in some cases.

If the tuition waiver is to be eliminated, revenue that is gathered from tuition charges should be used for new expenditures in research or graduate education rather than replacement funding to offset other sources. A means to maintain transparency and accountability in this allocation process is essential.

Faculty and student members of the ad hoc committee are firmly opposed to the proposal to eliminate the tuition waiver for graduate research assistants. The current system of tuition waivers represents a substantive institutional commitment to research and graduate education. Given the institutional context (relative expense of supporting graduate students) and current funding climate (decreasing agency support and poor economic state), we do not feel that the proposed policy would result in net benefits to the University of Connecticut.

II. Introduction and charge of the committee

The concept of eliminating or modifying the waiver of graduate tuition for GRAs on grants has been discussed within the Provost's office for several years, but no documentation of these discussions is available.

The Academic Plan that was completed in 2008 explicitly indicates an interest in examining the tuition waiver policy. Goal 6 of the Academic Plan, under the heading "Administrative Organization, Capital Infrastructure, and Budget Processes" is to "Establish administrative, infrastructural, and budget systems designed to efficiently realize the goals of the Academic Plan". Strategy C within Goal 6 is to "Pursue new revenue streams while refining existing budget processes". One of the items within Strategy C is to "Ensure that we are appropriately budgeting the costs of research and education programs in accord with the allowable costs articulated in our federal, state, and agency agreements, including indirect costs and the costs of supporting research assistants, while remaining competitive in our pursuit of extramural funding to support the goals of the Academic Plan".

Public forums regarding the academic plan that took place in the spring of 2008 alerted the University community of the possibility that tuition waiver policy might change and stimulated reactions of several legislative bodies. In February 2008, the Research Advisory Council adopted a statement (Appendix A) that detailed multiple negative consequences would result were the tuition waiver to be eliminated. The Executive Committee of the Graduate School (on 5 March 2008) and the Graduate Faculty Council (on 16 April 2008), passed on voice votes the following resolution:

> It is the sense of the Graduate Faculty Council that the introduction of tuition for graduate assistants would adversely affect the programs of the Graduate School and is inconsistent with key goals of the draft Academic Plan. We agree with and support the position of the Research Advisory Council statement regarding these waivers.
> We therefore urge that the policy of waiving tuition be continued.

A draft policy document clarifying how the cost of graduate students could be captured in external funds was circulated in June of 2008. It stated that the plan would

> …simply require that if a faculty member submits a research funding proposal to a federal funding agency[1] that includes in the direct costs support for graduate research assistants, then the direct costs of the proposal should also include the in-state tuition for all such graduate assistants, *provided this is permitted by the funding agency* [emphasis in original]. The plan calls for no other changes. The University would continue to provide tuition waivers for graduate teaching assistants and for graduate research assistants employed on state or local funds or from federal agencies that do not permit tuition to be charged on the direct costs of a grant.

Further documentation distributed by the Provost to this committee indicated that the change would be initiated for new grant proposals submitted after June 30, 2009. There would be no mandatory tuition charges levied on grants awarded prior to that date.

[1] Limitation of the proposed change to federal agencies in this document was an error, the proposed change was intended to apply to all external funding sources that permit the charge of graduate tuition to grants

The proposed change in tuition waiver policy was presented to the Senate by President Michael Hogan on 28 April 2008. Following this presentation a motion from the Senate University Budget Committee was passed by the Senate. In its amended form the motion read:

> The Senate University Budget Committee moves that the Senate Executive Committee and the Administration create a task force to examine the financial viability of the recent proposal to charge graduate student tuition to grants or other sources[2] and the resulting budget financial and academic impact on the total university. The task force would be comprised of representatives from the Senate, Graduate Faculty Council, Research Advisory Council, Graduate Student Senate, and appropriate Administration members. The task force will report back to the Senate by Spring 2009.

Appointments were made to the committee in May. The committee included representation from the office of the President, the Provost, faculty representation from multiple schools and colleges, and the Graduate Student Senate (Appendix B). The committee was initially chaired by the Provost. After discussing progress on the review of the proposal with the Senate Executive Committee, the Provost agreed to recuse himself from the ad hoc committee. Schultz and Singha agreed to serve as co-chairs on 6 November 2008.

The remainder of this report addresses the charge of the Senate's resolution in several sections. The financial impact of the proposed change is analyzed in Section III, wherein we estimate the additional revenue that would be captured if tuition was charged in grants from sources that permit such a charge. In Section IV, we focus on alternative ways of charging tuition to grants, and suggest means of implementation should the policy change be adopted. Subsequent sections consider academic impact as well as financial impact. Because the academic growth of the institution is affected by the relative expense of conducting research at the University of Connecticut in comparison to its peers, we present an analysis of GRA costs at selected research-intensive institutions, along with metrics of graduate enrollment and federal funding for research (Section V). The academic impacts on the University of charging tuition to grants are considered in Section VI.

III. Financial impact of eliminating tuition waiver at University of Connecticut

To estimate the revenue that would be realized with a change in policy, we began with an account of how many GRAs are supported in various units (Table 1). This accounting was done in the fall semester of 2007. At that time there were almost 600 GRAs on campus, in eight academic and two administrative units. The tuition costs for these GRAs, which appear in University financial statements as potential revenue lost to the Operating Fund, total more than $9 million[3]. This represents a starting point for our estimate of revenue potential if the blanket tuition waiver policy were eliminated. This starting point is listed as Scenario 1 in Table 2.

As a starting point, Scenario 1 assumes that tuition is recovered from all GRAs, i.e. that all GRAs are supported on grants from agencies that permit tuition charges as an allowable cost (Table 2). To make realistic adjustments away from this assumption, an exhaustive study of

[2] An amendment to add 'or other sources' was introduced by Senator Sally Reis, to cover support for GRAs that originates from the University of Connecticut Foundation.

[3] Tuition charges assessed to the General Fund used actual credit enrollment of each student and varied according to whether the student was in-state, out-of-state or international.

sponsored grants was conducted to determine if the sponsoring agencies had a declared policy on charging tuition on grants. The information was compiled by matching each student with his/her funding source and on the number of credit hours for which each student was enrolled. We found that more than 350 GRAs are supported on grants in which tuition is an allowable cost. About 50 are supported on grants in which tuition is not an allowable cost. The remaining 182 GRAs are supported on grants from agencies whose policy on tuition charges was not immediately evident. In lieu of contacting many agencies for clarification, we assumed that tuition charges would be permissible on half of the remaining GRAs. As a result of these adjustments, Scenario 2 (Table 2) assumes that there are about 460 GRAs on whom tuition could be charged. In another adjustment, Scenario 2 incorporates the Provost's agreement that tuition charged to grants will not exceed the full-time in-state rate. These adjustments reduce the revenue that would be realized by eliminating the tuition waiver to about $3.25 million.

Scenarios 1 and 2 assume that eliminating the tuition waiver would not change the number of GRAs. Two limiting factors could cause the number of GRAs to decrease if the tuition waiver were eliminated. The first limiting factor, which we can account for in our scenarios, is that grant amounts at many agencies are capped; in such cases, an increase in one charge category will occur at the expense of another category. Caps can be placed on the total grant request, or on personnel costs (e.g. NIH limits total GRA compensation to the amount paid to postdoctoral associates; grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/not98-168.html). To account for this limiting factor, we have assumed that in 50% to 75% of the grants, the student request is reduced so that the total grant request remains unchanged. The 50% to 75% figure was based on the type of research grants, and on feedback from researchers and program officers. It should be noted that the revenue realized by charging tuition for each GRA is partially offset by reduction in IDC, as grant expenses shift from categories that are subject to IDC charges into tuition, which is not subject to IDC. Hence, the effective revenue to the university is 68% of the tuition charged. The reduction factor of 68% was verified in 15 randomly selected grants. With these adjustments, Scenario 3 (Table 2) projects the revenue that can be realized by eliminating the tuition waiver to $2.5 million to $2.75 million. The corresponding reduction in the number of GRAs would be 110 to 165 (from a total of 600, a reduction of 18% to 28% of GRAs).

A second limiting factor that could cause the number of GRAs to decrease if the tuition waiver were eliminated is reduced incentive of PIs to support graduate students on grants. In other words, charging tuition to grants will make graduate students more expensive and may affect their value to sponsored research relative to other personnel categories, such as technicians and post-docs. We have not incorporated this factor in the revenue scenarios of Table 2 because there is no basis for quantifying how great the change in incentive may be. Nonetheless there is evidence that elimination of the tuition waiver will have a potent negative effect on GRA support (see Section VI). *Therefore the scenarios presented here must be regarded as generous projections of the revenue that might be captured were the tuition waiver to be eliminated.*

Scenarios 1-3 assume that the charge structure for tuition is unchanged. Some institutions charge a lower rate for GRAs that have passed doctoral qualifying exams and other requirements for degree candidacy. About 25% of GRAs at UConn are candidates for their degree. Scenario 4 (Table 2) envisions a tuition charge for candidate students that is 50% of the pre-candidacy rate. This scenario projects the revenue that can be realized by eliminating the tuition waiver for University of Connecticut graduate students to about $2.2 to $2.4 million.

The financial support of graduate students affiliated with the UConn Health Center differs from that of students on the main campus. The Health Center has about 150 PhD students, 140 of which are supported on grants. All PhD students on the Farmington campus are admitted as GRAs; approximately 40 GRAs that exclusively support 1st and 2nd year students are available through the Graduate Programs Committee (GPC). The remaining GRAs are funded by faculty grants, training grants (16), or individual awards to students as Individual National Research Service Awards. The assistantship includes a stipend (projected to be $27,500 for fiscal year 2010), student health plan and, currently, a waiver of tuition and the majority of fees. In keeping with NIH guidelines, the Health Center currently recovers 60% of tuition costs from training grants as well as individual NRSAs. These monies are used by the GPC in support of the graduate program. We estimate that elimination of the tuition waiver would yield slightly more than $200,000 (Table 2).

IV. Consideration of alternative methods of charging tuition to grants

Judging from a review of top universities and colleges (see Section V), there are four general categories of policy regarding tuition charges. The policy that is currently in place at the University of Connecticut permits a complete waiver of graduate tuition on all grants, even if tuition is an allowable cost on a proposal.

A second approach is referred to here as the *Actual Costs* approach. At such institutions the real costs of in-state tuition and fees for graduate assistants funded by a grant are required on budgets of all extramural grants and contracts, provided that these are allowable costs. The charge varies with the grade of the student's position (i.e. what UConn refers to as the level) and whether the student is a resident or nonresident. For example, at UCLA "[GRAs] appointed at 25% time or greater qualify for [100%] fee remissions …. The hiring department is responsible for paying these fee remissions from the same account-fund as the salary source…..[nonresident GRAs] …. qualify for nonresident tuition remission….. The hiring department is responsible for paying the nonresident tuition remission from the same account-fund as the salary source". Note that this requires adjustment of the budget if student(s) changes status.

In the *Projected Average Costs* approach, a University-determined tuition and fee recovery rate is required on all extramural grants and contracts supporting graduate assistants, provided that these are allowable costs. The university finance office and/or research administration office establishes the required level of tuition and fees that must be charged to grants and contracts. The established level of recovery is based on an estimate of current and future average tuition and fees that would be charged to students funded on grants, taking into account such factors as mix of pre-candidacy and in-candidacy students and differential tuition rates across programs over the life of grants. For example, at the University of Michigan "Resident tuition and fees are charged to sponsored accounts on the basis of the per term figures established by the Board of Regents…. [to] facilitate the preparation of budgets, sponsored projects are charged average tuition rates regardless of the number of credit hours for which the [GRAs] are enrolled". Note that this approach does not require adjustment to the budget if the student(s) change(s) status.

In the *Unit Decision* approach, departments have the option of charging tuition and fees to extramural grant budgets (and level of charge), but departments are charged tuition and fee costs for each student appointed as a graduate assistant (irrespective of funding source) by the Graduate School or other central administration unit. This is often used as part of a

Responsibility-Centered Management (RCM) budget approach, in which the responsibility of generating revenue through tuition charges lies with the unit, as does the allocation of service and administration costs. The goal of such a budgeting scheme is to increase revenue while decreasing costs through unit planning and unit-level control on tuition fees and enrollment.

If the complete tuition waiver were discontinued, we regard the Projected Average Costs approach as most suitable for the University of Connecticut. An important advantage of this policy is the simplicity of implementation. In contrast to the Actual Costs approach, grant budgets would not change when a student changes status (for instance, upon attainment of degree candidacy or state residency) or with changes in credits enrolled. Unit Decision budgeting would confer the benefits of local control over decision making but would not evidently be feasible to implement at the University of Connecticut. Projected Average Costs budgeting would require only that a PI estimate tuition charges on a grant based on a head count of GRAs. The charges to be levied on grants could be some proportion of full-time pre-candidate tuition rather than the full amount, reflecting the expectation that some GRAs will have achieved candidacy (which at many institutions results in a considerable reduction in tuition and fees charges, see Section V).

If the proposed elimination of the tuition waiver were to be implemented, imposition of GRA tuition and fees charges on grants must be flexible. Graduate fellowships present one area in which such flexibility is needed. Fellowships often provide only partial support and are typically supplemented with partial Teaching Assistantships or partial GRAs. Subjecting grants to the same tuition charge as a full GRA would be unfair and would have a detrimental effect on desirable fellowship funding. Therefore there must be some provision for proportionate tuition charges in these cases, or full waivers. At the same time, providing students with only partial support in total as a way of reducing tuition payments budgeted to a grant should not be allowed. Tuition waivers should remain in proposals going to agencies that require institutional or state match, which is often a substantial portion of the overall grant amount. The GRA tuition waiver has been an important source of such match for PIs, and should remain available. Another consideration is the size of the grant. Smaller grants have fewer degrees of freedom to absorb other costs; for instance, if grants are capped to relatively low amounts a PI may be forced to choose between supporting a GRA and having adequate supplies for the research.

Because it is not possible to anticipate all circumstances in which PIs would have a legitimate justification for retaining a tuition waiver, a review and appeals process should be established. This could be a separate tuition waiver appeals committee or an existing body such as the Research Advisory Council. Decisions need to be made on timely basis so the group needs to meet regularly and/or act swiftly.

V. Comparative analysis of graduate tuition practices

We conducted an analysis of the tuition charge policies of other institutions that are ranked among the top 25 public institutions (as identified by U.S. News and World Report[4],

[4] The Aspiration and Values section of the 2008 Academic Plan states "[O]ur aspiration is to emerge as one of the top-20 public universities in the nation." The position of the University in the U.S. News and World Report rankings is a matter for discussion every year upon release of the survey; in 2003 and 2007 the University of Connecticut was ranked among the top 25, and in 2008 UConn is in a four-way tie just below this group. The President and Provost have recently suggested ("Administrative Update", e-mail to UCONN_FACULTY-L@LISTSERV.UCONN.EDU, 12/11/2009) that U.S. News and World Report rankings of individual graduate

http://colleges.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/college/national-top-public). Information on these policies and other institutional attributes (Table 3) was solicited via phone contacts with institutional representatives in offices responsible for grants administration, budgeting and/or graduate schools. In some cases these contacts yielded memos reflecting institutional policy, while in other cases yielded only verbal communication of current practices. The data in some cases represent a selected scenario within the institution. For instance, graduate stipends can vary among programs within an institution, and in an effort to standardize the comparison we have tabulated the stipend for students in the natural sciences. Footnotes in the table provide annotations for other variables. Because it has a pronounced effect on the costs of supporting GRAs, the table includes data on graduate student unionization.

The top institutions vary in their tuition charge policy. The Actual Costs approach is employed at a slim majority of the institutions. Five institutions follow a Projected Average Costs approach, and six of the institutions use Unit Decision (RCM budgeting). Two institutions in this group, William & Mary and the University of Connecticut, do not require tuition charges on grants as a matter of institution-wide policy.

Tuition rates (including fees) were compared assuming a full-time pre-candidacy in-state rate. Among the institutions listed in Table 3, tuition at the University of Connecticut is above the median (8th highest out of 26 institutions tabulated). The other institution that does not currently require tuition charges on grants, William & Mary, is 9th.

Many institutions have a different rate for pre-candidacy and in-candidacy students. Usually the candidate rate is lower than the pre-candidate rate. The candidate rate is levied to students who have completed all coursework and passed their comprehensive or field exams. Such students may not take formal coursework, although in many instances they are registered for "dissertation" or "research" credit hours[5]. For the institutions listed in Table 3, a separate tuition and fees charge for candidate GRAs is listed. In almost half of the institutions listed (including the University of Connecticut), students who are supported on GRAs are not eligible for the candidate rate, and the number of semesters that a student can pay the reduced rate is limited. A limitation that applies at some institutions to students supported on GRAs but paying candidate rates is that the student must pay for health benefits, and has no access to institutional facilities. Such cases are indicated on Table 3.

We collected additional information on the differential between pre-candidate and candidate tuition charges at a broader set of 20 public universities[6]. These data indicate a sharply reduced tuition charge for GRA degree candidates at many of these institutions. At other institutions (e.g. University of Colorado) there is no tuition waiver for GRAs but the number of

---

programs at UConn may be used to identify those that should be protected in budgeting for the next fiscal years. Because this analysis was begun in Spring 2008, it uses the 2007 rankings.

[5] In some instances, candidate tuition and fees are based on reduced registration, and as a result, students are no longer considered full-time; this may compromise the visa status of international students.

[6] University of Cincinnati, Colorado State University, University of Illinois Chicago, **University of Illinois Urbana**, University of Indiana Bloomington, Iowa State University, **Kent State University**, Michigan State University, University of Minnesota Duluth, University of Minnesota Minneapolis, **University of Missouri**, **Montana State University**, **Ohio University**, **State University of New York Stony Brook**, **University of Massachusetts**, University of Louisville, **University of Toledo**, University of Utah, **Wayne State University**, University of Wisconsin Milwaukee. Institutions in which GRAs are eligible for reduced rates are indicated in bold.

credits on which the tuition is calculated may be reduced for post-candidacy students who are not subject to visa restrictions.

Other grad RA charges are listed in Table 3 assuming the minimum level of the GRA. At the University of Connecticut, stipends (ranked 10th highest), fringe rates (2rd highest), and F&A charges (two way-tie for rank of 10th/11th highest) are also high.

The cost of putting GRAs on grants is compared across the institutions in Table 3 by adding these charges according to institution policy. Hence, the cost to a proposal submitted to agencies where graduate student tuition is an allowable cost was estimated by adding graduate student stipend, fringe, F&A charges, and tuition if the institution or unit (for Unit Decision institutions) permits. Comparison among institutions is conducted for both pre-candidate and candidate GRAs. In the latter case, the candidate GRA cost is less than the pre-candidate GRA cost only if the institution GRAs are eligible for the reduced candidate tuition rate.

Under the present policy (full tuition waiver), the total GRA cost at UConn is close to the median of the top public institutions listed in Table 3. The present cost of a GRA at the University of Connecticut is slightly above $36,000. For pre-candidate GRAs, the cost at UConn is 15th highest (13th highest among the 21 institutions that have an institution-wide policy, i.e., non-Unit Decides institutions). An increase of $1100 in pre-candidate GRA costs per academic year would locate UConn at the median of the top public institutions. For candidate GRAs, the cost at UConn is at the median (13th highest of the 26 institutions listed, median = $36,160; 11th highest of the institutions with an institution-wide policy).

Under the proposed policy wherein graduate tuition would be added to the charges, the cost for a GRA at the University of Connecticut would be above the median. The cost of a GRA at the University of Connecticut would be slightly above $46,000. That cost would place UConn as the 7th highest of the pre-candidate costs among all institutions listed in Table 3 (5th highest of the institutions with an institution-wide policy). That cost would place UConn as the 3rd highest of the candidate costs, among all institutions listed in Table 3 as well as the 21 with an institution-wide policy.

Our review of top institutions included data on graduate program size and trends in federal funding. Comparison of graduate program size was conducted in response to concern that charging graduate tuition to grants will reduce graduate student enrollments. Two statistics were used for this comparison, the present ratio of graduate students to full-time faculty and the change over the last 5 years in graduate enrollment. The University of Connecticut is presently ranked highly in both of these metrics (6th and 5th respectively). With respect to recent changes in federal funding, the University of Connecticut is below the group median (22nd). Whether eliminating the GRA tuition waiver has had a detrimental effect on graduate enrollment or federal funding at these institutions cannot be assessed from these data, because information on these statistics during the period prior to waiver elimination is not available.

VI. Potential academic impacts of implementing proposal to eliminate GRA tuition waiver

A consequence of charging tuition on grants is that the incentive to support graduate students on grants will decrease relative to other costs. A comparable alternative use for grant funds would be support of postdoctoral associates. To evaluate the relative costs of GRAs and postdoctoral associates, we estimated the 100%-time (40 hours per week) equivalent of a GRA[7]. The full-time equivalent of a GRA costs a little more than $97,000 without the tuition charge, and a little more than $117,000 if tuition is charged to the grant. In comparison, a postdoctoral associate costs a little more than $71,000[8]. Hence, GRA assistance for research is already 36% more expensive than a postdoctoral associate. With the tuition charge, GRA assistance with research would cost 64% more than a postdoctoral associate[9]. As a result of this higher cost, some shift in the character of the research workforce towards postdoctoral associates and away from graduate students seems inevitable. We note that there may be unanticipated changes in the quality of this workforce as a result of this shift; one concern is that the Storrs region is not as attractive to postdoctoral associates, who have different needs than graduate students. Another consequence, given the reduction in the proportion of graduate students who are supported on GRAs, is that the proportion of students who are supported on TAs will rise (although the number of students who are supported on TAs is not likely to rise as it is dictated by the size of the undergraduate student body). This may have the effect of increasing graduate time to degree.

A survey was conducted of University of Connecticut faculty in December 2008 and January 2009 to characterize reactions to the proposed elimination of the tuition waiver, and to assess possible academic consequences. More than 400 faculty participated in the survey, comprising more than one-quarter of the faculty at the University.

Responses from the survey came from a diverse range of faculty (Table 4). Liberal Arts and Sciences faculty comprised the majority of respondents, and there was strong participation from faculty in the School of Engineering, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, and the Neag School of Education. Most respondents were full or associate professors. The respondents were research active; more than half generate more than $100,000 in research revenues each year. A plurality is funded by federal agencies. Most have at least three graduate students at present and graduated at least three students in the last five years.

Respondents recognized that tuition charges were permitted by funding agencies. Most felt that at least some of the agencies supporting their research permitted tuition charges on grants (Table 4). Of those that had an opinion, only 24% felt that none of the agencies permitted tuition charges.

Perceived academic consequences of eliminating the tuition waiver include reductions in graduate support and other changes in the workforce. Survey responses provided strong evidence for reduced employment of GRAs. Of those respondents who had an opinion on the question (who were four-fifths of the respondents), 93% predicted that they would support fewer

---

[7] Calendar year stipend of $25,090 plus fringe benefits at a rate of 26.6% during the academic year and 7.7% during the summer, plus F&A costs, multiplied by 2.
[8] Stipend of $36,996 plus fringe benefits at a rate of 26.6% during the calendar year plus F&A costs.
[9] NIH places a cap on GRA compensation so that it does not exceed the total compensation for a postdoctoral associate. Our estimate of GRA costs with tuition may exceed this cap.

GRAs if the proposal to end tuition waivers was implemented (Table 4). This concern about potential reduction in support extended to Masters students (89% of those with an opinion predicted reduction in masters student support). Responses were less clear-cut with respect to changes in postdoctoral support. A relatively high percentage (28%) responded with no opinion. About as many responded that their proposals would include fewer postdocs or the same number as those that responded they would support more postdocs (Table 4).

Survey results indicate a widespread feeling that tuition charges would reduce funds available for other uses in grants. Nine-tenths of respondents had an opinion on this question; of those 96% predicted that funds available for other grant expenses would decrease (Table 4).

A portion of the survey was designed to assess opinions of how GRA tuition and fees that are recovered in grants should be allocated. The Provost has agreed that all revenues collected through GRA tuition charges would be expended in support of graduate education and research. Most respondents (81% of those with an opinion, 73% overall) feel that funds for graduate student recruitment are inadequate. When presented with a range of possible uses, there was most enthusiasm for allocating the funds to existing graduate student support as RAs or fellowships (60%-70% ranked as highest or next-to-highest priority). There was slightly less support for returning the funds to PIs or the PI's academic unit (54% ranked as highest or next-to-highest). There was weak support for using the funds for faculty start-up packages, equipment grants, or honors student research; in each case the proportion of respondents who viewed these uses as lowest priority exceeded those who viewed them as highest priority. Respondents were also encouraged to suggest other uses for the funds. Nineteen respondents reiterated support for graduate student programs and suggested various kinds of fellowships, awards, or additional TA support. Fifteen reiterated or clarified support for returning the funds to PIs or the PI's academic unit. Ten comments detailed how funds could be used for postdoctoral support, visiting professorships or more widely distributed support for faculty. Two suggested that the funds could be used to improve grant administration. One respondent reported that institutions have had to pay penalties for using tuition recovery fund for some of the allocations listed in the survey (e.g. start-ups, honors programs).

The task force agrees that funds should be used for graduate student support. We emphasize that these new revenues should be used for additional support of graduate education and research, rather than as replacement funding to offset losses of funding from other sources. It would be important to maintain accountability and transparency in these uses of graduate tuition funds.

An important issue regarding use of funds that would be recovered should the proposal be implemented is how funds should be allocated among larger University units. One guiding principle should be fair return of the funds to those that generated the GRA support. For instance, any monies generated by Health Center faculty should be returned to the Health Center for use by the Graduate Programs Committee to further research and graduate education. Any monies generated by Storrs faculty would remain at Storrs. Within the Storrs campus, there also are various possible strategies for allocating the money for research. One suggestion was to use the existing formulas used by the RAC for large grants. Another suggestion is to return money to colleges, or even to departments that generate the funds.

Faculty members of this committee concur with survey respondents that there are potential negative academic impacts of the proposal. To document whether concerns about

negative repercussions are widely felt, the survey included an invitation to make general comments about the proposal to eliminate the graduate tuition waiver. We received more than 200 such comments through the survey, and additional direct communications via e-mail. Rather than including each comment in the report, we identified themes that we summarize here. These themes should be regarded as reflecting the consensus of faculty members of the task force.

The major concern is that the implementation of charging tuition to grants will be detrimental to research programs at the University of Connecticut. This view predicts that the policy will decrease the amount of dollars available for research due to formal (hard) or informal soft caps in funding. As stated by one respondent: "As a former NSF program officer, I can assure you that….adding a tuition line to a grant will not lead to the awarding of larger grants but only to a reduction in other lines in the grant". Such reductions in grant-supported resources will affect research productivity, and decrease the research competitiveness of UConn. Similarly, charging tuition to grants will reduce motivation for doing research and will result in the loss of competitive faculty. Many respondents expressed a serious concern that the implementation of this policy is being proposed in the middle of this uncertain economic climate, with "cuts" in funding and shrinking resources for conducting research. Some respondents stated that they would be less motivated to write grants when additional costs not related to their own research are proposed. There was also a concern of losing faculty to other institutions.

There is widespread perception that charging tuition to grants will reduce the number of graduate students, to the detriment of the University. Faculty consider graduate students "the lifeblood of the research programs". Many believe that the role of graduate students in supporting research is underestimated and the decrease in their number will have a disproportionate effect on research. Some respondents stated that they will hire more post-doctoral associates instead of graduate students if the policy is implemented, but recruitment and retention of post-docs for a time sufficient for the research program may be difficult in Storrs. The perceived repercussions extend beyond the research component of the University. Many respondents noted that graduate education is an important University function. Some warned that reducing the number of graduate students will have a negative impact of unknown magnitude on graduate programs that are already struggling for funding.

The current climate for research funding is doubtless contributing to negative attitudes regarding the proposal among the faculty. Federal funding for research is stagnant (AAAS fiscal year reports on Research and Development, www.aaas.org/spp/rd/). After more than 10 years of increasing size of Research Project Grant (RPG) awards, award sizes leveled out in 2003 and are now dropping. RPG success rate was level until 2003 and is now decreasing. The overall NIH budget parallels this temporal pattern. Similarly, the NSF budget has leveled or fallen slightly since 2004. The state and nation are now in recession and further substantial cuts to state funding of the University, after a recent round of 3% reductions, are imminent. In this climate, University leadership must consider every possible unrealized source of new revenue; this report is an effort to consider one source in a comprehensive way.

A decision regarding the tuition waiver requires balancing revenues gains in dollar terms against cost in terms of academic character and competitiveness. From the faculty's perspective, elimination of the tuition waiver would yield a net loss to the University of Connecticut.

Table 1. Graduate Research Assistants supported on grants at the University of Connecticut.[1]

Unit	Head Count	Salary (A)	Fringe/WC (B)	Tuition Waiver (C)	Total (A+B+C)
CANR	77	$1,223,868	$198,526	$1,151,286	$2,573,680
CLAS	180	$3,196,171	$520,976	$2,732,147	$6,449,293
BUSINESS	1	$9,408	$1,534	$8,442	$19,384
EDUCATION	57	$960,072	$153,011	$912,626	$2,025,709
ENGINEERING	161	$2,791,194	$454,563	$2,646,224	$5,891,981
NURSING	1	$11,006	$1,571	$19,488	$32,065
PHARMACY	24	$422,352	$67,868	$402,788	$893,009
MATERIALS SCIENCE INST	51	$926,134	$150,960	$876,554	$1,953,648
VPMA	1	$11,006	$1,794	$5,628	$18,428
VPRGE	43	$718,212	$117,069	$552,680	$1,387,961
Grand Total	597	$10,269,423	$1,667,872	$9,307,863	$21,245,158

[1]The table reports data as of 11/8/2007. Units with no GRAs (e.g. Fine Arts) are not included in the table. Academic year tuition waiver amount is estimated by multiplying fall tuition waivers by 2. University of Connecticut Health Center GRAs are not included in this table; description of UCHC GRAs is provided in the text.

Table 2. Estimating the revenue that can be captured by eliminating the tuition waiver.

Scenario	Expected Revenue	# of RA's	Tuition charge allowability	Grant size capped	Tuition rates used
1	$9,307,863	597	All agencies assumed to allow tuition charge	No	Actual tuition
2	$3,276,605	597	Only agencies estimated to allow tuition charge	No	In-State only
3	$2,490,220 to $2,752,348	431 to 486	Only agencies estimated to allow tuition charge	Yes, in 50% to 75% of grants	In-State only
4	$2,178,943 to $2,408,305	431 to 486	Only agencies estimated to allow tuition charge	Yes, in 50% to 75% of grants	In-State only and ABD rate of 50% pre-candidacy
UCHC	$224,000[2]	140	NIH allows tuition charge	GRA compensation is limited[1]	Limited to $3200

[1] NIH has established the entry-level postdoctoral NRSA stipend (presently $36,996 per year at the UCHC) as the limit for total compensation of a graduate student. Recoverable tuition limit of $3200 per student/per year is estimated based on UCHC GRA salary and fringe of $33,825.

[2] GRA salary of $27,500 + 23% fringe equals $33,825. Full tuition cannot be charged on GRA because of NIH cap on GRA compensation, so UCHC can recover $3200 per student annually, or about $448,000 for all student supported on GRA. This is discounted by 50% as these funds shift from categories that are subject to 50% IDC into tuition, which is not subject to IDC.

Table 3. Effects of Tuition on Grants/Contracts at Top-25 Public Universities.

Institu-tion[1]	Grad Union[2]	Tuition policy[3]	Pre-Candidate T&F[4]	Candidate T&F[5]	Candidate T&F Policy[6]	Stipend[7]	Fringe[8]	F&A	Costs per pcGRA[9]	Costs per cGRA[10]	Grad per Faculty[11]	Δ Grad Enroll-ment[12]	Δ Fed. Funds[13]
GaTech	NU	AC	$6,444	$1,008	UD	$22,000	NA	0.52	$48,755	$39,263	7.1	11.15%	26.60%
OhioSt	NCBU	UD	$9,438	$2,052		$16,700	0.065	0.5	$36,116	$28,730	2.4	2.14%	59.20%
PennSt	NU	PAC	$14,228	$2,900		$14,175	0.154	0.475	$36,708	$36,708	4.5	-0.06%	22.00%
Pitt	NU	AC	$15,530	$1,650		$14,000	0.075	0.515	$38,331	$24,451	3.8	8.95%	22.20%
Purdue	NU	PAC	$7,264	$346	GRA NE	$14,000	0.09	0.525	$28,449	$28,449	2.9	0.02%	21.90%
Rutgers	CBU	UD	$13,855	$1,144	UD	$19,815	0.195	0.545	$50,439	$37,728	3.2	1.20%	17.60%
TexAM	NU	AC	$7,256	$1,411	GRA NE	$19,500	0.083	0.455	$37,983	$37,983	3.3	7.13%	16.40%
UCB	CBU	UD	$9,579	$432	GRA NE	$24,318	0.17	0.53	$53,111	$43,964	4.3	6.14%	9.90%
UCD	CBU	AC	$9,651	$246	GRA NE	$24,318	0.25	0.52	$55,855	$46,450	2.2	-20.51%	19.10%
UCI	CBU	AC	$9,642	$288	GRA NE	$24,318	0.23	0.515	$54,957	$45,603	3	6.03%	27.00%
UCLA	CBU	AC	$8,968	$180	GRA NE	$24,318	0.068	0.54	$48,964	$40,176	4.1	0.22%	14.90%
UConn	NU	NC	$10,052	$572	GRA NE	$18,818	0.268	0.52	$36,269	$36,269	4.8	8.71%	11.80%
UCSB	CBU	AC	$10,108	$262	GRA NE	$24,318	0.03	0.515	$48,055	$48,055	2.7	0.20%	20.10%
UCSD	CBU	PAC	$9,442	$238	GRA NE	$17,000	0.013	0.545	$36,048	$36,048	3.6	14.05%	15.90%
UF	CBU	AC	$7,478	$1,810	GRA NE	$16,800	0.093	0.465	$32,189	$32,189	5.9	11.28%	27.40%
UGa	NU	PAC	$6,150	$2,748		$16,800	0.05	0.475	$31,797	$31,797	3.2	-3.35%	-1.30%
UIowa	CBU	UD	$7,158	$1,736		$16,277	0.19	0.5	$36,212	$30,790	3.7	-6.16%	9.80%
UIUC	CBU	PAC	$8,374	$586	NB NF	$15,000	0.061	0.585	$33,625	$33,625	5.1	0.88%	-0.70%
UMd	NCBU	AC	$8,766	$1,470		$13,098	0.32	0.5	$34,700	$27,404	4.6	5.37%	14.50%
UMich	CBU	PAC	$16,674	$10,606		$16,070	0.163	0.545	$43,904	$43,904	4.2	1.64%	15.00%
UNC	NU	UD	$6,236	$3,986		$14,000	0.211	0.475	$31,243	$28,993	5	-1.09%	17.30%
UTex	NU	AC	$6,738	$1,820	GRA NE	$18,648	0.085	0.52	$37,492	$37,492	3.9	-2.17%	17.70%
UVa	NU	UD	$11,240	$287		$10,000	NA	0.515	$23,568	$17,619	5.6	7.93%	17.50%
UWash	CBU	AC	$9,417	$500	GRA NE	$19,512	0.133	0.56	$45,549	$45,549	3	0.68%	15.00%
UWisc	CBU	AC	$10,500	$2,560		$16,029	0.245	0.485	$40,135	$32,195	3.1	-4.19%	24.10%
W&M	NU	NC	$9,800	$600	NB NF	$12,000	0	0.44	$17,280	$17,880	1.7	-2.25%	32.40%

[1]GaTech: Georgia Institute of Technology; OhioSt: The Ohio State University; PennSt: The Pennsylvania State University; Pitt: University of Pittsburgh; Purdue: Purdue University; Rutgers: Rutgers University; TexAM : Texas A&M University; UCB: University of California, Berkeley; UCD: University of California, Davis; UCI: University of California, Irvine; UCLA: University of California, Los Angeles; UConn: University of Connecticut; UCSB: University of California, Santa Barbara; UCSD: University of California, San Diego; UF: University of Florida; UGa: University of Georgia; UIowa: University of Iowa; UIUC: University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign; UMd: University of Maryland; UMich: University of Michigan; UNC: University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; UTex: University of Texas, Austin; UVa: University of Virginia; UWash: University of Washington; UWisc: University of Wisconsin; W&M: The College of William and Mary

[2]CBU: collective bargaining unit; NCBU: unionized but no collective bargaining unit; NU: no union

[3]AC: actual cost; NC: no cost; PAC: projected average cost; UD: unit decision

[4]For institutions with differential tuition across graduate programs, the amount listed reflects the rate for natural sciences. For PAC institutions, the amount required on grants is listed rather than the amount indicated on the tuition schedule.

[5]Amounts listed are based on the lowest possible fee for students who achieve candidacy status at their institutions. The amount listed is twice the per-term rate of tuition and fees for students who are candidates and are all-but-dissertation. At some institutions (particularly those listed in next column as GRA NE), the reduced rate is offered only for one semester, or in some cases additional semesters upon petition

[6]NB NF: For students on reduced rate, institution does not pay for benefits, and facilities (IT, library, labs/studios, office space, faculty time) are not available; GRA NE: Graduate RAs are not eligible for reduced rate; UD: unit determines if student may pay reduced fee

[7]The amount here is the stipend for an entry-level student.

[8]Fringe rates are estimates because institutions vary in how they are assessed. When value is NA the median value for the other institutions is used in calculations.

[9]Pre-candidate tuition and fees (if tuition policy is not NC), stipend and fringe, and F&A charges for stipend and fringe.

[10]Tuition and fees (if tuition policy is not NC), stipend and fringe, and F&A charges for stipend and fringe. This column uses candidate tuition and fees if GRAs are eligible for reduced rate (candidate t&f policy is not GRA NE), and uses precandidate tuition and fees if GRAs are not eligible for reduced rate

[11]The ratio of graduate students per full-time faculty

[12]Percent change in grad enrollment 2003-2007; data from Common Data Set.

[13]Percent change in federal research funds 2003-2006; reflects most recent data available from NSF.

Table 4. Responses to survey questions. Results for each question are presented as the percentage that selected an alternative, and the total number who responded to the question (N).

Academic Unit[1]	CANR	CLAS	CoFA	SoE	SoB	SoPh	Other[2]	N
	11.00%	56%	2.50%	14%	2%	2.80%	12%	398

Location	Avery Point	Hartford	Torrington	Waterbury	Stamford	Storrs	N
	4.5%	4.0%	0%	0%	0.25%	91%	398

Rank	Adjunct	Assistant	Associate	Full	N
	2%	25%	33%	39%	398

Research revenues[3]	$0 - $5000	$5001 - $10,000	$10,001 - $100,000	$100,001 - $200,000	> $200,001	N
	20%	6.0%	32%	23%	19%	396

Funding sources[4]	Federal Government	State	Industry	Internal	Other
	43%	15%	12%	15%	15%

Graduated students[5]	0	1-2	3-5	6-10	>10	N
	16%	24%	31%	15%	14%	396

Table 4. Responses to survey questions (cont'd).

Current students[6]	0	1-2	3-5	6-10	>10	N
	11%	28%	40%	12%	9.4%	396

Graduate tuition permitted[7]	None	Some	Most	All	No opinion	N
	19%	37%	15%	8.6%	21%	418

Effect on GRAs[8]	Fewer	Same number	More	No opinion	N
	85%	6.2%	0.24%	8.8%	420

Effect on postdocs[9]	Fewer	Same number	More	No opinion	N
	27%	7.9%	37%	28%	417

Effect on MS students[10]	Fewer	Same number	More	No opinion	N
	71%	8.1%	0.72%	20%	419

Table 4. Responses to survey questions (cont'd).

Funds for other expenses[11]	Decrease	Stay the same	Increase	No opinion	N
	86%	3.6%	0.24%	10%	419

Funds for grad recruitment[12]	Inadequate	Adequate	Generous	no opinion	N
	73%	16%	0.24%	10%	420

Allocation of new revenues[13]

	1 (Highest)	2	3	4	5 (Lowest)	N
University funded RA	53%	13%	8.1%	8.4%	17%	406
Graduate student recruitment	22%	23%	25%	13%	17%	403
Return of funds[14]	35%	19%	18%	9.2%	19%	401
New faculty start-up packages	9.8%	15%	22%	18%	36%	399
Equipment[15]	11%	12%	19%	17%	41%	396
Additional graduate fellowships	40%	21%	14%	9.7%	15%	401
Honors student research	15%	8.6%	17%	17%	43%	393
Other	42%	4.3%	7%	2.6%	44%	115[16]

Table 4. Responses to survey questions (cont'd).

[1]University of Connecticut Health Center faculty were not included in this survey for logistical reasons. Units listed are College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, College of Fine Arts, School of Engineering, School of Business, School of Pharmacy.

[2]Probably most respondents in this category were in Neag School of Education, a response option that was inadvertently omitted from this question of the survey

[3]Full text of question: Approximate average research revenues per year (choose one)

[4]Respondents were asked to choose all options that apply; total number of responses to this question exceeds number of survey respondents

[5]Full text of question: Number of graduated MS and PhD students in the past five years

[6]Full text of question: Current number of MS and PhD students

[7]Full text of question: To my knowledge, of the funding sources I apply to, graduate tuition is permitted as a charged item on my grant applications

[8]Full text of question: If I am required to add the tuition charge for graduate students, my proposals will include:

[9]Full text of question: If I am required to add the tuition charge for graduate students, my proposal will include:

[10]Full text of question: If I am required to add the tuition charge for graduate students, my research group will include:

[11]Full text of question: If I am required to add the tuition charge for graduate students, when I am awarded funds the funds available for other expenses on the grant will:

[12]Full text of question: Funds available for recruitment of graduate students are:

[13]Full text of question: A fundamental part of this plan, if implemented, would be to take money gathered from tuition payments on grants and earmark it for research and graduate education. Which type of investment would you favor? (high priority = 1, low priority = 5):

[14] Some return of funds to the faculty member or the member's academic unit

[15]Large multi-user equipment purchases

[16]Additional comments on proposal to eliminate tuition waiver and reallocation of revenue (16; all negative); return of funds to PI or academic unit (15, all in favor); use of funds to support graduate students (additional fellowships of various kinds, additional funding for TAs, additional funding for grad school; 18); use of funds in OSP/grant administration (2, in favor); use of funds for postdoctoral support or visiting professorships (4, in favor); use of funds for faculty (5, for example to offset equipment breakage, bridge funding, funding for outreach); miscellaneous (4, for example allocate to operating fund)

Appendix A. STORRS RESEARCH ADVISORY COUNCIL STATEMENT ON TUITION CHARGES TO GRANTS (February 2008)

The Storrs Research Advisory Council applauds President Hogan's articulated research and graduate education agenda. e.g., "We need to strengthen our research profile and also build more really top-notch graduate programs. Building a substantial presence at the graduate level and enhancing our sponsored research and other forms of research are exactly what a university needs to sustain its high position and move up from 25 into the top 20." (UConn Advance, Oct 1, 2007).

We propose that the ongoing discussion regarding recovery of graduate student tuition on faculty grants presents an ideal opportunity to quickly implement the President's vision. UConn's research profile has lagged behind that of its peers in a number of respects. At this time, the Administration has the opportunity to move UConn forward, by fostering an environment that directly supports the all-important graduate and research programs that a healthy Research I enterprise requires.

As active and productive members of the University's Research community, we find the proposal to charge graduate tuition to research grants to be counterproductive. We question whether the proposed action will generate sufficient revenue to counterbalance the multitude of negative effects it will have on UConn's research enterprise. For the following reasons, we believe this policy will make it unlikely that we will achieve our goal of improving our status among Research I institutions any time in the near future.

1. **Graduate student enrollment would decline because a major incentive for supporting grads would disappear.** Data from institutions (e.g., UMass) that have recently instituted graduate tuition charges (or their equivalent) to grants show that these Institutions have experienced declines in the number of graduate students. This is because charging tuition on grants makes graduate research assistants disproportionately expensive. Up to this point, a major incentive for PIs at UConn to request grant support for graduate students has been that the expense was reasonable when balanced against the amount of time committed to a project by a graduate student. Charging tuition to grants will put this amount over the threshold of reasonable PI behavior. A PI wishing to maximize his or her output from a particular award would be foolish (and perhaps even negligent) to request support for a graduate student, contributing 20 hours per week on a project, over a technical assistant or post-doctoral fellow, contributing 40 hours per week, given their respective annual costs (i.e., Tier II grad salary + fringe and tuition = $31,469; technician lowest level salary + fringe = $41,504; post-doc $43,026; the hourly labor cost for a graduate student would be $30, compared to $20 for a technician or $21 for a postdoc). The resultant predictable decline in number of graduate students would have a negative impact on UConn's national standing given that the number of Ph.D. degrees conferred annually is an important measure of a University's research productivity as indicated by most major indices (e.g., Lombardi, NRC, etc). However, we also note that this decline would reduce the amount of funds the Administration would capture from tuition charges. UConn currently has a total of ~5,500 graduate students, ~1,200 of which are supported on research assistantships, approximately half of which would be eligible for tuition charges. If this number were to decline, tuition charges are likely to yield only a few million dollars. The council wonders if the negative impact on UConn's research reputation alone is worth the gain in funds? (i.e., ~2.1 million if 500 RAs at 50% tuition, 4.2 million if 500 RAs at 100%).

2. **Tangible support for research.** UConn's research infrastructure lags well behind that of its peer institutions, and certainly well behind that of its aspirant institutions. However, the tuition waiver for graduate research assistants supported on external grants that UConn currently provides, represents a glowing example of an effective and tangible exception to this situation, and serves to compensate for other inadequacies in research support.

3. **Caps on new awards DO exist.** Many granting agencies and/or programs have specifically articulated caps on awards (e.g., NSF's PEET:750K/5yrs; USDA: 400K/2yrs; NSF IGERT: 650K/yr); others have relatively well understood upper limits that are readily obtained from program officers (e.g., NSF BS&I: 500Ktotal). Research costs increase each year, despite the fact that the expectations of funding agencies have certainly not declined, nor have the budgets of such programs increased. Forward thinking Institutions will recognize this reality and do what they can to enable their PIs to accomplish the goals of their projects, rather than require their PIs to make do with less overall research funding, and thus with fewer personnel. Maintaining the policy of waiving graduate tuition on grants will increase UConn's research productivity relative to that of institutions without such policies.

4. **Caps on continuing awards are also very REAL.** PIs are experiencing similar caps on continuing awards. For example, annual budget increases that PIs have garnered from agencies such as DOE barely cover annual standard salary and fringe increases. e.g., awards that provided support for 2 graduate students in the past, now support only 1.5 students; the tuition charge will reduce this by another half a student. Competitive renewals from NIH are restricted to increases of 20% over previous awards; while this would cover the proposed tuition charge, it would not serve NIH's purpose of allowing the researcher to cover increases in costs of supplies and annual salaries, fringe, etc.

5. **Graduate students are key elements of undergraduate research.** By all measures, a healthy graduate program is a pivotal component of the success of undergraduate programs at Research I institutions, which must include a diversity of undergraduate research opportunities. Through their informal interactions with undergraduate students, which occur most often in research lab settings, graduate students are key to the success of undergraduate research programs. Given the Administration's ambitious plans to substantially increase the size of the Honors Program, it seems clear that the proposed change in tuition charges will have a negative impact on undergraduate education at a particularly inopportune time. Because of the informal nature of their contributions to undergraduate research education, we note that the contributions of graduate students occur at no additional cost to undergraduate education.

6. **Harm would be unevenly distributed among units.** The hardship resulting from the proposed change would not be evenly distributed among schools and colleges. In fact, it would disproportionately affect some of our most research active science and engineering programs, many of which do not have the service courses necessary to buffer the effects of the penalty because they allow for more TA positions. Ultimately, the cost, given limited funds, would be transferred to graduate students in the form of salary cuts. As a consequence, some students would become second-class citizens, in particular teaching assistants (with full tuition waivers) would garner salaries that might greatly exceed those of research assistants.

7. **Reduction in IDC rate.** The RAC suspects that the proposed new policy would adversely affect future indirect cost rate negotiations with sponsoring agencies. The criteria that are considered in the assessment of this rate currently include personnel costs; the extent of the impact is unclear at this time but would bear consideration.

8. **Bad timing!** The current granting climate is unusually poor. Competition is severe. At this time PIs need as much assistance as possible from their institutions in order to remain viable, competitive members of funding communities. To remain competitive they must maximize their productivity with the relatively limited funds available to them. Charging tuition on grants would place an additional drain on already strained budgets, effectively increasing the indirect cost rate. This is the last thing PIs need in this difficult funding climate.

Those of us who have been meeting with OSP Director candidates over the past few weeks can attest that the experiences of these individuals at other Universities support our

recommendations. If tuition charges against grants were to be imposed at UConn, there would indeed be a decline in the number of grad students supported on grants.

The members of the RAC have seen no detailed, thoughtful cost-benefit analysis of the effects of this initiative on research and graduate education at the University. In the absence of such data, we have based our analysis on our collective two centuries of research experience. In the absence of concrete data to the contrary, we believe that our assessment of the tuition charge initiative is both realistic and accurate.

It seems ironic that, if the Administration were to be presented with a new initiative aimed at improving the University's research endeavors and graduate programs at a cost of several million dollars, they would surely be quick to embrace that initiative and that investment. The RAC asserts that a decision by UConn to continue its support of tuition waivers for graduate research assistants would serve as a well-timed research and graduate program stimulus that would greatly benefit UConn’s standing in its community of peer institutions.

Appendix B. MEMBERSHIP OF THE TASK FORCE

Jeffrey Bernath, Graduate School Senate
Maria-Luz Fernandez, Nutritional Sciences
Sandra Hewett, Neuroscience
Kazem Kazerounian, Mechanical Engineering
Paul McDowell, Controller
Rachel O'Neill, Molecular and Cell Biology
John Salamone, Psychology
Eric Schultz, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
Suman Singha, Interim Vice President for Research and Graduate Education
Winthrop Smith, Physics
Lisa Troyer, Senior Associate to the President and Chief of Staff

Financial Aid &

Retention & Graduation Task Force

Report

University Senate

Monday, February 2, 2009

Prepared by the
Division of Enrollment Planning, Management, and Institutional Research

M. Dolan Evanovich
Vice-President

Table 1.

University of Connecticut
Student Financial Aid

Merit and Need-Based Aid

Undergraduate Recruitment Scholarships

	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	One-Year Change
Day of Pride	483,932	498,776	567,816	511,304	(56,512)
Nutmeg	276,168	248,026	227,363	248,993	21,630
Merit Scholarships *	4,891,652	4,928,591	6,566,506	6.516,258	(50,248)
Total	**5,651,752**	**5,675,393**	**7,361,685**	**7,258,863**	**(102,822)**

Undergraduate Need-Based Aid

	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	One-Year Change
University Support **	26,898,710	29,335,047	34,351,487	31,581,883	(2,769,604)
State Support	7,840,248	8,940,905	9,731,851	14,379,496	4,647,645
Federal Support	9,537,684	9,808,605	10,982,814	12,570,874	1,588,060
Loans	101,121,232	111,476,497	118,182,862	128,386,967	10,204,105
Total	**145,397,874**	**159,561,054**	**173,248,744**	**186,919,220**	**13,670,476**

* Includes Academic Excellence, Leadership, Presidential

** Includes Student Employment and Required Matches

Retention and Graduation Task Force Update

Introduction

The University of Connecticut has experienced unprecedented growth in four-year graduation rates, climbing ten percentage points in just the last two years. We are now a leader nationally on this measure, ranking 11th among 58 public research universities in four-year graduation rate and 8th in average amount of time to earn a degree. This is particularly pertinent in today's higher education climate. Personal and societal expectations that accompanied increases in access at the end of the last century and into the new one, coupled with a growing emphasis on accountability and outcomes assessment have drawn increased attention to *timely* degree completion. Also, in the current economy, parents and students have become even more acutely aware of the financial benefits of completing a degree on time.

UConn's approach is consistent with the assertion by Adelman (2006) that timely degree completion can be measured by what contributes to and detracts from students' academic momentum. Retention & Graduation Task Force efforts have focused on statistically identifying factors associated with leavers and stayers and developing actionable recommendations for improvement. Our university's strategic approach reflect a cornerstone philosophy championed by many including Tinto (1993) and Kuh (2005) that students' early meaningful academic and social integration into the college environment is essential to their success and persistence, and that it is the institution's responsibility to support that connection.

Stronger, more diverse entering classes connect with UConn early on in many ways: with faculty and staff in the classroom and individually through undergraduate research opportunities; with other freshmen through the First-Year Experience program; with students in like situations such as other undecided majors who are advised in the Academic Center for Exploratory Students or because of shared interests in residential learning communities, and with peers supported by the Honors Program, Student Support Services, the Counseling Program for Intercollegiate Athletes, and the Center for Students with Disabilities. Also, course availability has been bolstered by an annual reallocation of $7.8 million for additional sections and additional seats in sections.

This rich academic experience is complemented by student participation in our many student organizations and activities, cultural centers, recreational facilities, and intramural programs. Thus, our students' growing success in earning a degree on time is a product of students' hard work and an institution-wide commitment to their having the opportunity to achieve that important outcome.

Retention Rates

Retention success is boosted by stronger incoming cohorts, and the growth in quality and diversity among these over the past decade is well-chronicled, and continues. Average SAT scores reached 1200 this year, up 8 points from last year and, the portion of the incoming class who are minority students rose from 19% to 20%. Table 2 indicates we retain our freshmen at a high rate. Table A3 in the Appendix indicates that we rank 15th among 58 public research universities in freshman retention rate.

Table 2. Freshman Retention Rates of UConn Storrs Incoming Freshmen

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
All	88%	88%	90%	92%	93%	93%	93%
Minority	87%	88%	89%	93%	91%	91%	92%

Note: For peer and national comparison purposes, Storrs data is used.

Table 3 shows that at the regional campuses retention rates for all and minority incoming freshmen dropped slightly from last year, by one percentage point. Reasons for the drop in regional campus minority retention from its peak two years ago are addressed in the quantitative and qualitative longitudinal data analysis section of this report.

Table 3. Freshman Retention Rates of UConn Regional Campuses Incoming Freshmen							
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
All	77%	76%	79%	79%	79%	79%	78%
Minority	80%	81%	81%	78%	83%	80%	79%

Graduation Rates

Table 4 indicates our graduation rates are up substantially, particularly our four-year rate which is up 23 percentage points for all and 21 percentage points for minority freshmen over the past nine years. Tables A1-A6 in the Appendix illustrates the strength of our retention and graduation rates, nationally.

Table 4. Graduation Rates of UConn Storrs Campus									
Incoming Freshmen:	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
4-Year Graduation Rate									
All	43%	46%	45%	50%	53%	54%	56%	61%	66%
Minority	33%	36%	38%	42%	44%	43%	42%	51%	54%
5-Year Graduation Rate									
All	66%	66%	67%	69%	71%	72%	74%	76%	na
Minority	59%	62%	62%	62%	65%	64%	66%	68%	na
6-Year Graduation Rate									
All	69%	70%	71%	72%	74%	75%	76%	na	na
Minority	65%	69%	67%	66%	69%	68%	70%	na	na

Six-year graduation rates for the Fall 2002 entering class at the regional campuses, in Table 5 below, are significantly higher than those for all and minority freshmen entering in 1996. And, compared to last year, there was a two-percent increase for all freshman and six-percent increase for minority freshmen.

Table 5. Six-Year Graduation Rates of UConn Regional Campuses							
Incoming Freshmen:	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
All	41%	42%	45%	42%	46%	46%	48%
Minority	44%	42%	47%	37%	44%	47%	53%

Quantitative Analyses

Tenth day fall semester data of previous incoming students were analyzed to identify characteristics more prominent among leavers than the general population. Demographic, entry-level, and academic-year student profile and performance data as they related to return status were analyzed. For freshmen, GPA cutoffs of 2.75 at Storrs and 2.50 at regional campuses were used to define voluntary leavers above and below median cumulative freshman grade point average. Currently, we have eight years of retention data regarding freshmen, four years of sophomore data, and three years of transfer student data for both Storrs and the regional campuses.

The most recent retention rates for Storrs freshmen (2007 incoming class) and sophomores (2006) are 93% and 87%. The most recent rates for regional campuses are 78% and 65%. It should be noted that voluntary leavers significantly and consistently outnumber involuntary leavers among freshmen, sophomores, and transfer students. Findings from our quantitative analyses are summarized below.

Freshman Retention (Fall 2000-2007 Incoming Classes)

Storrs Campus:
- significantly more men were dismissed than *statistically predicted (i.e., a higher proportion of men among involuntary leavers than the proportion of men in the freshman population)*
- significantly more women with GPAs >= 2.75 left voluntarily than statistically predicted
- significantly more African-American and Hispanic students left involuntarily than statistically predicted
- significantly more out-of-state students left voluntarily than statistically predicted, particularly among those with a GPA of >= 2.75
- dismissed students and voluntary leavers who earned a GPA < 2.75 were less likely to have enrolled in INTD180

Regional Campuses:
- slightly more regional campus men left involuntarily or with GPA < 2.50 than statistically predicted, and more women with GPA >= 2.50 left than statistically predicted
- more non-minority students left voluntarily with GPA >= 2.50 than statistically predicted

Sophomore Retention (Fall 2003-2006 Incoming Classes)

Storrs Campus:
- significantly more men left involuntarily than statistically predicted
- more African-American and Hispanic students left involuntarily than statistically predicted
- slightly more in-state students left involuntarily than statistically predicted
- significantly more out-of-state students left voluntarily than statistically predicted

Regional Campuses:
- slightly more men were dismissed than statistically predicted
- slightly more women left voluntarily than statistically predicted
- slightly more Hispanic students left involuntarily than statistically predicted

Transfer Student Retention (Fall 2005-2007 Incoming Classes)

Storrs Campus:
- most incoming transfers enrolled as sophomores, were from institutions that were four-year schools, public, and located out-of-state
- 86% of incoming transfers persisted beyond their first-year at UConn Storrs campus
- significantly more men left involuntarily than statistically predicted

Regional Campuses:
- most incoming transfers enrolled as sophomores or freshmen, were from institutions that were four-year schools, public, and located in-state
- significantly more men left involuntarily than statistically predicted

Qualitative Analyses

Our qualitative research comes from phone surveys of voluntary leavers during which they indicate future plans (if transferring, to which institution), reasons for leaving, things we could have done better, and steps we should take to improve retention. For the first time this year, data also was incorporated from withdrawal information regarding individual students provided by the Departments of Residential Life and Student Services. Leaver feedback, as in the past, was categorized as *academic, environmental, personal, or cost-related.* The qualitative data base for both Storrs and the regional campuses now contains six years regarding freshmen, three years for sophomores, and two year for transfer students.

Freshman Attrition (Fall 2002-2007 Incoming Classes)

Storrs Campus:
- in-state and out-of-state students were more likely to identify reasons for leaving associated with the environment, such as *rural setting* and *institutional size*
- in-state students were likely to transfer to CSU and the community colleges
- out-of-state students transferred to schools in their home state or closer to home
- the most often cited academic reason among freshmen was *major options;* personal reasons cited as often were *not being ready or not the right fit*
- while many students indicated that *nothing could have been done better,* suggested areas for improvement included *providing more activities, advising, class size, and reducing cost*

Regional Campuses:
- *major options, institutional fit* and *cost* were most often mentioned as reasons for leaving
- student suggestions included *better advising, offering a greater breadth of classes,* and *reducing tuition*

Sophomore Attrition (Fall 2004-2006 Incoming Classes)

Storrs Campus:
- *major options* and *institutional fit* were the most often cited reasons for leaving
- student suggestions included *offering more major options* and *reducing cost*

Regional Campuses:
- *major options* and *cost* were most often mentioned as reasons for leaving
- student suggestions included *better advising, offering a greater breadth of classes,* and *reducing tuition*

Transfer Student Attrition (Fall 2006-2007 Incoming Classes)

Storrs Campus:
- *personal/family issues and major options* were most often cited as reasons for leaving
- the suggestion provided most often was *better advising*

Regional Campuses:
- *major options, institutional fit and cost* were most often cited reasons for leaving
- suggestions included *better advising and greater breadth of classes*

Graduation Analyses

During the past year, two new analyses were added to our database. The first analysis tracked the Fall 2003 cohort of first-time, full-time Storrs and regional campus incoming freshmen to analyze characteristics of those who graduated within four years and those who finished within five years. Also,

a follow up analysis of Fall 2000 freshmen who completed degrees elsewhere as of November 2008 was conducted using the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) Student Tracker.

Follow-Up of Fall 2003 UConn Freshmen Earning their Degree at UConn within Four to Five Years

Summary data from these analyses are presented below:

- More women entering the Storrs campus as freshmen in Fall 2003 graduated within four years than statistically predicted based on norm percentages.
- Storrs campus students graduating within four years entered as freshmen with significantly more credits.
- Storrs campus students graduating within five years also brought in more credits but not as many as those graduating on time.
- SAT scores for regional campus students who finished within four years were higher on average than statistically predicted.
- Although regional campus students graduating within four years entered with significantly more credits as freshmen; most regional campus students enrolled without any advanced credits.
- SAT Math scores were slightly higher on average than the norm for regional campus freshmen graduating within five years.

Fall 2008 Follow-Up of Fall 2000 UConn Freshmen Earning their Degree Elsewhere

Follow up information was requested from NSC on the 1,095 student leavers from the 3,561 University of Connecticut Fall 2000 full-time freshman cohorts. Since most but not all schools participate in the Clearinghouse, NSC's Student Tracker found and reported 866 students. Findings include the following:

- In addition to our 74% Storrs 6-Yr graduation rate for this cohort, another 9% earned bachelor's degrees elsewhere.
- The corresponding figures for the Regional Campuses are 46% and 12%.
- About 2/3 of the 106 in-state students earning a bachelor's elsewhere earned them in-state, and the vast majority of them from CSU institutions.
- 140 of the 141 out-of-state students earning bachelor's degrees elsewhere earned them out-of-state.
- Almost 7 out of 10 of the 89 regional campus students who earned a degree elsewhere earned them at an in-state institution, again the vast majority from CSU institutions.
- Associates degrees were awarded to a total of 30 former Storrs and regional campus students, almost exclusively at Connecticut community colleges.
- Of degrees awarded out-of-state New York, Massachusetts, and New Jersey schools had the most.
- 62% of bachelor's degrees awarded elsewhere were awarded to females.

Intentionality

Examples of University initiatives that have had an impact on retention and graduation include:

Academic Support

- Academic advising, a cornerstone of retention is done by faculty and professional advisors in centers in each of our schools and colleges, and the Academic Center for Exploratory Students (ACES) advises freshmen undecided about a major or who are in pre-professional programs.
- The First-Year Experience program serves over 80% of students in their freshman year.
- *Qualitative* and *Writing Centers* assist students looking to improve performance in these areas.
- Students who follow-up on mid-term academic warnings often improve their performance.
- Talented high school students can take first-year university courses in advance, and our research findings indicated that students with advanced credit like this are more likely to graduate on time.

- Students can pursue their goals through numerous enrichment opportunities including undergraduate research, individualized majors, scholarships, study abroad, and e-portfolio.
- Students in academic programs with more prescribed curricula benefit from packaged scheduling.
- UCONN CONNECTS provides academic support for first and second-year students whose academic performance leaves them at risk and has received very positive user feedback from users.
- The Registrar's office reaches out to students who have left the University just short of graduation or who have not enrolled for the coming semester without explanation.
- The 2007 *Report of the Gateway Courses Committee* offered recommendations to increase the success of underrepresented groups in these often rigorous science and math-related courses.
- The Counseling Program for Intercollegiate Athletes reported that a recent survey showed the NCAA Graduation Success Rate for our African-American football student-athletes placed us 7th among 68 teams participating in bowl games this year and 1st among state institutions.

Co-Curricular

- Incoming students cite the New Husky website as their most often used information source.
- Theme learning communities (honors, first-year students, women in science, global house) connect students with common interests, nurturing their experience.
- Over 350 organizations, a comprehensive intramural athletic program, club sports, and exercise and recreational facilities are accessed extensively by students.
- Renovated and expanded Student Union facilities including a new food court serve as a hub for both commuter and resident students.
- The AlcoholEdu program assists students with making healthy choices.
- Academic support and business services housed in two centralized locations and augmented with on-line services have made them more accessible and user-friendly.
- Our Department of Recreational Services reported 557,889 total participations last year. A 2004 study by the National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association supported existing research that participation in recreational sports is a key determinant of satisfaction and success in college.
- Over 1,000 students participate in 39 club sports at UConn.

Diversity

- Multiple outreach programs to urban schools lay a foundation for future academic success.
- Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics (STEM) support programs provide guidance and role models for students in these high demand areas.
- Summer programs for new students such as *BRIDGE* for underrepresented minorities and women looking to develop a stronger math and science foundation for engineering have been successful.
- Partnerships with school systems and the corporate sector have nurtured access and academic success.
- Multicultural Centers provide academic and social support for an increasingly diverse student body.

Student Input

- Entry level surveys during orientation indicate students' high expectations for freshman year and provide us with important input regarding for facilitating their transition from high school to college.
- The Retention and Graduation Task Force, includes a student representative who facilitates communication this between this group and the USG Academic Affairs committee, among others.
- Satisfaction surveys offer feedback regarding students' met or unmet needs and their perceptions of their academic and overall experience. Three-fourths of seniors completing this survey indicated they would attend UConn again and would recommend it to others.
- The Summer Session 2007 Assessment garnered 6,675 student responses, reflecting an interest in summer enrollment to get or stay on track to graduation. Students indicated the following reasons for falling behind: time off, low semester credit loads, and changing majors.

Summary

The University of Connecticut has earned national recognition, often turned to by other institutions for advice regarding how they could adapt what we have done to achieve similar results. That is a testimony to the strategic, positive, caring, nurturing and productive environment that permeates the UConn experience. We look forward to coming back to you next year with another update to apprise you regarding the results of all of your hard work and commitment to student success.

Retention & Graduation Task Force Membership

Dolan Evanovich, Chair	Vice President, Enrollment Planning, Management, and Institutional Research
Bruce Cohen	Director, Counseling Program for Intercollegiate Athletes
Pamela Fischl	Assistant to the University Registrar for R&G Outreach
Lynne Goodstein	Associate Vice Provost and Director, Honors Program
Douglas Hamilton	Associate Dean, CLAS & Department Head, Physics
Steven Jarvi	Assistant Vice Provost, Academic Center for Entering Students
Lauren Jorgensen	IPEDS and External Survey Coordinator/Webmaster/Student Data
Steve Kremer	Assistant Vice President, Residential Life
Gary Lewicki	Director, Research and Assessment
Maria Martinez	Director, Center for Academic Programs
David Ouimette	Executive Program Director, First Year Programs
Willena Price	Director, African American Cultural Center
Maria Sedotti	Coordinator, Orientation Services
Jeffrey von Munkwitz-Smith	University Senate / University Registrar
David Williams	Director, Hartford Campus
Lee Williams	Dean of Students
Michelle Williams	University Senate / Associate Professor, Psychology
David Yalof	Associate Professor, Department of Political Science
Steven Zinn	Professor, Department of Animal Science
Vacant (TBD)	Student Representative (USG)
Jonna Kulikowich	Consultant

References

Adelman, Clifford. *The Toolbox Revisited: Paths to Degree Completion From High School Through College.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 2006.

Kuh, G.D. (2005). *The national survey of student engagement.* University of Indiana.

National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association. *The Value of Recreational Sports in Higher Education: Impact on Student Enrollment, Success, and Buying Power. 2004.*

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Appendices

Table A1. University of Connecticut vs. Other Public Research Peer Universities: Four-Year Graduation Rate		
Rank	Institution	Rate
1	U. of Virginia	84%
2	U. of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	71%
3	U. of Michigan-Ann Arbor	70%
4	U. of California-Los Angeles	66%
5	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	63%
6	U. of California-Berkeley	61%
7	U. of Maryland at College Park	58%
7	Pennsylvania State University	58%
9	U. of California-San Diego	56%
10	U. of Pittsburgh	55%
11	**U. of Connecticut**	54%
12	U. of Florida	53%
13	U. of California-Irvine	51%
13	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	51%
15	Indiana U. at Bloomington	50%
15	U. of California-Santa Barbara	50%
17	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	49%
18	U. of Washington	48%
18	U. of Georgia	48%
18	Rutgers State U. of New Brunswick, NJ	48%
18	Florida State University	48%
22	U. of Texas at Austin	47%
23	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	46%
24	Michigan State University	44%
25	U. of California-Davis	43%
26	University of Missouri-Columbia	41%
26	University of Colorado at Boulder	41%
28	Ohio State University	40%
28	U. of Iowa	40%
30	Stony Brook University	39%
30	U. of Buffalo	39%
32	Texas A&M University-College Station	38%
33	North Carolina State University at Raleigh	37%
33	U. of Minnesota-Twin Cities	37%
35	Purdue University-West Lafayette	36%
36	Colorado State University	35%
37	Georgia Institute of Technology	33%
37	U. of Arizona at Tucson	33%
39	Iowa State University	32%
40	U. of Kansas	31%
40	Temple University	31%
42	U. of Kentucky	30%
42	Oregon State University	30%
44	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	29%
45	Arizona State University at Tempe	28%
46	West Virginia University	26%
47	LSU	25%
48	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	23%
49	U. of Illinois at Chicago	22%
50	U. of Utah	21%
51	Virginia Commonwealth University	20%
51	Utah State University	20%
53	U. of Cincinnati	18%
54	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	15%
55	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	14%
56	Wayne State University	13%
57	New Mexico State University	12%
57	U. of New Mexico	12%

Source: IPEDS Peer Analysis System, 2007 Graduation Rate Survey for 2001 entering freshman cohort. OIR/Dec. 2008

Table A2. University of Connecticut vs. Other Public Research Peer Universities: Average Time to Graduate Among Students Earning Baccalaureate Degrees Within Six Years, Fall 2007		
Rank	Institution	Average Time to Graduate
1	University of Virginia	4.11
2	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	4.16
3	University of Michigan-Ann Arbor	4.23
4	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	4.26
5	University of California-Los Angeles	4.28
6	University of Massachusetts-Amherst	4.30
6	University of Maryland at College Park	4.30
8	University of Pittsburgh	4.31
8	**University of Connecticut**	**4.31**
10	Pennsylvania State University	4.34
11	Indiana U. at Bloomington	4.35
11	University of California-Berkeley	4.35
11	Florida State University	4.35
14	University of California-San Diego	4.38
15	Stony Brook University	4.39
15	U. of Florida	4.39
15	University of California-Irvine	4.39
18	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	4.40
19	U. of Washington	4.42
20	U. of Georgia	4.43
20	Rutgers State U. of New Brunswick, NJ	4.43
20	U. of Buffalo	4.43
23	University of California-Santa Barbara	4.44
23	University of Missouri-Columbia	4.44
25	Purdue University-West Lafayette	4.45
26	U. of Texas at Austin	4.46
26	U. of Iowa	4.46
28	University of Colorado at Boulder	4.47
28	Michigan State University	4.47
28	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	4.47
31	U. of Minnesota-Twin Cities	4.50
32	U. of Arizona at Tucson	4.51
32	Colorado State University	4.51
34	Ohio State University	4.52
35	North Carolina State University at Raleigh	4.54
35	University of California-Davis	4.54
37	Temple University	4.56
38	U. of Kansas	4.57
38	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	4.57
40	Texas A&M University-College Station	4.58
41	LSU	4.59
41	Iowa State University	4.59
43	Oregon State University	4.61
44	Arizona State University-Tempe	4.62
44	University of Kentucky	4.62
46	West Virginia University	4.63
47	Virginia Commonwealth University	4.68
47	Georgia Institute of Technology-Main Campus	4.68
49	University of Illinois at Chicago	4.69
50	University of Cincinnati	4.71
51	Utah State University	4.73
52	University of Nebraska at Lincoln	4.77
53	Wayne State University	4.85
53	University of Alabama at Birmingham	4.85
55	U. of Utah	4.86
56	New Mexico State University	4.89
57	U. of New Mexico	4.91
58	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	4.95

Source: IPEDS Peer Analysis System, 2007 Graduation Rate Survey. Avg time to graduate derived from 2007 Graduation Rate data for 2001 cohort. OIR/Dec. 2008

Table A3. Storrs Campus vs. Other Public Research Peer Universities Average Freshman to Sophomore Retention Rate, Fall 2007		
1	U. of California at Los Angeles	97
1	U. of California at Berkeley	97
1	U. of Virginia	97
4	U. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	96
4	U. of Michigan	96
6	U. of California at Irvine	94
6	U. of California at San Diego	94
6	U. of Florida	94
6	Pennsylvania State University	94
10	U. Maryland at College Park	93
10	U. of Texas at Austin	93
10	U. of Washington	93
10	U. of Georgia	93
10	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	93
15	Georgia Institute of Technology	92
15	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	92
15	U. of Connecticut	92
15	Texas A & M University-College Station	92
19	U. of California at Santa Barbara	91
19	Michigan State University	91
19	Ohio State University	91
22	U. of California at Davis	90
22	North Carolina State University	90
22	U. of Pittsburgh	90
22	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	90
26	Rutgers University - New Brunswick, NJ	89
27	State U. of New York at Stony Brook	88
27	Florida State University	88
27	Indiana U. at Bloomington	88
30	U. of Buffalo	87
30	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	87
32	Temple University	85
32	U. of Missouri at Columbia	85
32	Purdue University-West Lafayette	85
32	Iowa State University	85
36	LSU	84
36	U. of Colorado at Boulder	84
36	U. of Iowa	84
39	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	83
39	U. of Massachusetts - Amherst	83
39	Colorado State University	83
42	Oregon State University	81
42	U. of Kansas	81
42	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	81
42	U. of Utah	81
42	West Virginia University	81
42	Virginia Commonwealth U.	81
48	U. of Cincinnati	80
49	U. of Arizona at Tucson	79
50	U. of Illinois at Chicago	78
50	Arizona State University at Tempe	78
50	U. of Kentucky	78
53	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	77
54	U. of New Mexico	76
54	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	76
56	New Mexico State University	73
56	Utah State University	73
58	Wayne State University	71

Retention rate: Average percent of 2003-2006 freshmen returning the following fall.
Source: *U.S. News and World Report: 2009 Edition America's Best Colleges*. Fall 2007 data was requested. OIR/December 2008

Table A4. Storrs Campus vs. Other Public Research Peer Universities

	Six-Year All Freshman Graduation Rate			Six-Year Minority Freshman Graduation Rate	
1	U. of Virginia	93	1	U. of Virginia	92
2	U. of California at Los Angeles	90	2	U. of California at Los Angeles	89
3	U. of California at Berkeley	88	3	U. of California at Berkeley	87
3	U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor	88	4	U. of California at San Diego	85
5	U. of California at Santa Barbara	85	5	U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor	84
6	U. of California at San Diego	84	6	U. of California at Irvine	80
6	Pennsylvania State University	84	7	U. of California at Davis	78
8	U. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	83	8	U. of Florida	77
9	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	82	9	Georgia Institute of Technology	76
10	U. of Florida	81	9	U. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	76
11	U. of California at Irvine	80	9	U. of California at Santa Barbara	76
11	U. of Maryland at College Park	80	9	U. of Texas at Austin	76
11	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	80	9	U. of Maryland at College Park	76
14	U. of California at Davis	79	14	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	74
15	U. of Texas at Austin	78	14	Pennsylvania State University	74
15	Georgia Institute of Technology	78	14	U. of Washington	74
15	Texas A & M University-College Station	78	14	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	74
15	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	78	14	U. of Georgia	74
15	U. of Georgia	78	19	Texas A & M University-College Station	71
20	U. of Washington	75	19	Rutgers State U. of New Brunswick,NJ	71
20	U. of Connecticut	75	21	Florida State University	69
20	U. of Pittsburgh	74	22	U. of Connecticut	68
23	Michigan State University	74	23	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	66
24	Rutgers State U. of New Brunswick,NJ	73	24	U. of Pittsburgh	65
25	Indiana U. at Bloomington	72	25	Stony Brook U.	64
26	Ohio State University	71	26	Ohio State University	63
27	Florida State University	69	27	Michigan State University	62
27	North Carolina State University	69	28	North Carolina State University	61
27	Purdue University-West Lafayette	69	29	Indiana U. at Bloomington	60
30	U. of Missouri at Columbia	68	30	Purdue University-West Lafayette	59
31	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	67	30	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	59
31	U. of Colorado at Boulder	67	30	U. of Colorado at Boulder	59
33	U. of Iowa	66	33	U. of Missouri at Columbia	58
33	Iowa State University	66	33	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	58
35	Colorado State University	64	33	Temple University	58
36	U. of Buffalo	63	33	Colorado State University	58
36	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	63	37	U. of Iowa	57
36	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	63	38	Iowa State University	56
39	Oregon State University	61	39	U. of Kansas	55
39	U. of Kentucky	61	40	U. of Buffalo	54
41	LSU	60	40	Oregon State University	54
41	U. of Kansas	60	42	U. of Kentucky	53
43	Temple University	59	42	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	53
43	Stony Brook U.	59	44	LSU	52
45	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	58	45	U. of Arizona at Tucson	51
46	U. of Arizona at Tucson	56	45	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	51
46	Arizona State University at Tempe	56	47	Arizona State University at Tempe	50
46	U. of Utah	56	47	U. of Utah	50
49	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	55	49	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	49
49	West Virginia University	55	50	U. of Illinois at Chicago	47
51	U. of Cincinnati	52	50	Virginia Commonwealth U.	47
52	U. of Illinois at Chicago	50	52	West Virginia University	44
53	Virginia Commonwealth U.	47	53	Utah State University	42
54	Utah State University	45	53	New Mexico State University	42
55	New Mexico State University	44	55	U. of New Mexico	39
55	U. of New Mexico	44	56	U. of Cincinnati	36
57	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	38	56	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	36
58	Wayne State University	32	58	Wayne State University	18

Source: *U.S. News and World Report: 2008 Edition America's Best Colleges*. Fall 2007 data was requested. Source: IPEDS Peer Analysis System, 2007 Graduation Rate Survey, 2001 entering freshmen cohort. OIR/December 2008

Table A5. Storrs Campus vs. Other Public Research Peer Universities, Fall 2007 Entering Freshmen

	SAT 75th Percentile			Top 10% of High School Class	
1	U. of California at Berkeley	1470	1	U. of California at Berkeley	99
2	U. of California at Los Angeles	1430	1	U. of California at San Diego	99
3	Georgia Institute of Technology	1420	3	U. of California at Los Angeles	97
3	U. of Virginia	1420	4	U. of California at Santa Barbara	96
5	U. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	1400	4	U. of California at Irvine	96
6	U. of Maryland at College Park	1380	6	U. of California at Davis	95
7	U. of Texas at Austin	1370	7	U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor	92
8	U. of Florida	1360	8	U. of Virginia	87
8	U. of California at San Diego	1360	9	U. of Washington	86
10	U. of Pittsburgh	1340	10	U. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	76
11	U. of Washington	1320	10	U. of Florida	76
12	U. of Georgia	1310	12	U. of Maryland at College Park	71
12	U. of California at Santa Barbara	1310	13	U. of Texas at Austin	69
14	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	1300	14	Georgia Institute of Technology	66
14	Rutgers State U. of New Brunswick,NJ	1300	15	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	60
14	Pennsylvania State University	1300	16	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	55
14	Texas A & M University-College Station	1300	17	U. of Georgia	53
14	U. of California at Irvine	1300	18	Ohio State University	52
19	U. of Connecticut	1290	19	U. of Pittsburgh	48
19	U. of California at Davis	1290	20	Pennsylvania State University	45
21	Stony Brook U.	1280	20	Texas A & M University-College Station	45
22	Florida State University	1270	22	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	44
22	Purdue University-West Lafayette	1270	23	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	40
24	North Carolina State University	1260	23	Rutgers State U. of New Brunswick,NJ	40
24	U. of Buffalo	1260	23	U. of Connecticut	40
24	Indiana U. at Bloomington	1260	26	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	39
27	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	1240	27	Stony Brook U.	36
28	U. of Arizona at Tucson	1220	28	North Carolina State University	34
28	Arizona State University at Tempe	1220	28	U. of Arizona at Tucson	34
30	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	1190	30	Florida State University	33
30	Oregon State University	1190	31	Indiana U. at Bloomington	31
32	Temple University	1180	31	Purdue University-West Lafayette	31
33	Virginia Commonwealth U.	1170	33	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	30
	ACT Scores (ranked individually)		34	Michigan State University	29
1	U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor	31	35	U. of Kansas	28
1	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	31	36	LSU	27
3	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	30	36	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	27
4	Ohio State University	29	36	Arizona State University at Tempe	27
4	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	29	39	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	26
6	LSU	28	39	Iowa State University	26
6	U. of Colorado at Boulder	28	39	U. of Missouri at Columbia	26
6	U. of Missouri at Columbia	28	42	U. of Colorado at Boulder	25
6	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	28	42	U. of Kentucky	25
6	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	28	42	U. of Utah	25
11	Michigan State University	27	42	Wayne State University	25
11	U. of Iowa	27	46	U. of Buffalo	24
11	U. of Kansas	27	47	U. of Illinois at Chicago	23
11	Iowa State University	27	47	U. of Iowa	23
11	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	27	49	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	22
11	U. of Cincinnati	27	49	University of New Mexico	22
11	U. of Kentucky	27	51	Utah State University	21
11	U. of Utah	27	52	U. of Cincinnati	20
11	Utah State University	27	53	Oregon State University	19
20	Colorado State University	26	53	Colorado State University	19
20	U. of Illinois at Chicago	26	53	Temple University	19
20	West Virginia U.	26	56	New Mexico State University	18
23	University of New Mexico	25	56	West Virginia U.	18
24	Wayne State University	24	58	Virginia Commonwealth U.	15
25	New Mexico State University	23			

Source: *U.S. News and World Report: 2009 Edition America's Best Colleges*. Fall 2007 data was requested. OIR/December 2008

Table A6. Storrs Campus vs. Other Public Research Peer Universities, Fall 2007 Entering Freshmen

	SAT 25th Percentile	
1	Georgia Institute of Technology	1240
2	U. of California at Berkeley	1220
3	U. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	1210
4	U. of Virginia	1200
5	U. of California at Los Angeles	1180
6	U. of Maryland at College Park	1170
7	U. of Pittsburgh	1150
8	U. of Florida	1140
9	U. of California at San Diego	1130
9	U. of Georgia	1130
11	U. of Texas at Austin	1110
12	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	1100
13	Rutgers State U. of New Brunswick	1090
13	U. of Washington	1090
13	Florida State University	1090
13	U. of Connecticut	1090
13	Pennsylvania State University	1090
18	Stony Brook U.	1080
18	Texas A & M University-College Station	1080
20	U. of California at Irvin	1070
20	U. of California at Santa Barbara	1070
20	North Carolina State University	1070
23	U. of Buffalo	1040
24	U. of California at Davis	1030
24	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	1030
24	Indiana U. at Bloomington	1030
27	Purdue University-West Lafayette	1020
28	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	990
29	Temple University	980
30	U. of Arizona at Tucson	970
31	Virginia Commonwealth U.	960
31	Arizona State University at Tempe	960
33	Oregon State University	950
	ACT Scores (ranked individually)	
1	U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor	27
2	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	26
2	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	26
4	Ohio State University	25
5	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	24
6	Michigan State University	23
6	LSU	23
6	U. of Colorado at Boulder	23
6	U. of Missouri at Columbia	23
6	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	23
6	U. of Iowa	23
12	Colorado State University	22
12	U. of Kansas	22
12	Iowa State University	22
12	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	22
16	U. of Illinois at Chicago	21
16	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	21
16	U. of Cincinnati	21
16	U. of Kentucky	21
16	U. of Utah	21
16	West Virginia U.	21
22	Utah State University	20
23	U. New Mexico	19
24	New Mexico State University	17
24	Wayne State University	17

	Top Quarter of High School Class	
1	U. of California at Berkeley	100
1	U. of California at Los Angeles	100
1	U. of California at San Diego	100
1	U. of California at Irvine	100
1	U. of California at Davis	100
6	U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor	99
7	U. of California at Santa Barbara	98
8	U. of Washington	97
9	Georgia Institute of Technology	96
9	U. of Virginia	96
11	U. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	95
12	U. of Texas at Austin	94
13	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	93
14	U. of Florida	92
15	U. of Maryland at College Park	90
16	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	89
16	Ohio State University	89
18	U. of Georgia	87
19	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	84
20	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	82
21	U. of Pittsburgh	81
21	Rutgers State U. of New Brunswick	81
21	U. of Connecticut	81
21	Pennsylvania State University	81
25	North Carolina State University	78
26	Texas A & M University-College Station	76
27	Stony Brook U.	72
28	Florida State University	69
28	Michigan State University	69
28	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	69
31	Indiana U. at Bloomington U.	68
32	U. of Arizona at Tucson	64
33	Purdue University-West Lafayette	63
34	U. of Buffalo	62
35	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	60
35	U. of Kansas	60
37	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	58
37	U. of Colorado at Boulder	58
37	Iowa State University	58
37	U. of Illinois at Chicago	58
41	U. of Missouri at Columbia	57
42	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	56
43	LSU	55
44	U. of Iowa	54
45	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	53
46	Temple University	52
46	Arizona State University at Tempe	52
48	U. of Kentucky	50
49	Oregon State University	49
49	U. of Utah	49
49	Utah State University	49
49	U. New Mexico	49
53	Colorado State University	48
54	U. of Cincinnati	46
56	New Mexico State University	46
56	West Virginia U.	43
57	Virginia Commonwealth U.	42
	Wayne State University	NA

Source: *U.S. News and World Report: 2009 Edition America's Best Colleges*. Fall 2007 data was requested. OIR/December 2008

Table A7. University of Connecticut Most Recent Retention and Graduation Rates for Entering Freshman Classes by Campus as of Fall 2008

Storrs	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2007	**93**			
Fall 2006	93	**87**		
Fall 2005	93	88	**86**	
Fall 2004	92	85	83	
Fall 2003	90	84	80	
Fall 2002	88	82	79	**76**
Fall 2001	88	81	78	75
Fall 2000	89	80	78	74
Fall 1999	88	79	75	72
Fall 1998	86	79	75	71
Fall 1997	87	78	75	70

Please Note: Retention percentages include early graduates. Graduation rates are calculated according to Federal Student Right to Know legislation and the NCAA Graduation Rates Policy. Graduation rates include students graduating in the summer session of the sixth year of study. Starting Fall 2005, retention rates are calculated based on full-time, baccalaureate entering classes.

Total Regionals	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2007	**78**			
Fall 2006	79	**65**		
Fall 2005	79	62	**58**	
Fall 2004	79	65	59	
Fall 2003	79	66	59	
Fall 2002	76	61	56	**48**
Fall 2001	77	60	53	46
Fall 2000	74	60	53	46
Fall 1999	74	56	52	42
Fall 1998	78	60	51	45
Fall 1997	74	57	50	42

Stamford	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2007	**83**			
Fall 2006	79	**74**		
Fall 2005	80	67	**66**	
Fall 2004	82	70	64	
Fall 2003	81	72	60	
Fall 2002	71	61	59	**49**
Fall 2001	78	67	62	55
Fall 2000	78	70	64	57
Fall 1999	74	60	55	46
Fall 1998	76	60	54	50
Fall 1997	82	67	66	54

Avery Point	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2007	**76**			
Fall 2006	82	**64**		
Fall 2005	75	56	**52**	
Fall 2004	75	59	56	
Fall 2003	80	65	60	
Fall 2002	81	60	52	**44**
Fall 2001	70	43	37	32
Fall 2000	71	51	43	38
Fall 1999	72	48	48	37
Fall 1998	74	52	41	31
Fall 1997	68	43	38	29

Torrington	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2007	**63**			
Fall 2006	70	**50**		
Fall 2005	67	54	**44**	
Fall 2004	73	63	47	
Fall 2003	82	73	66	
Fall 2002	74	62	50	**47**
Fall 2001	75	53	49	47
Fall 2000	68	63	52	58
Fall 1999	77	56	50	44
Fall 1998	78	63	54	42
Fall 1997	92	68	60	56

Hartford	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2007	**80**			
Fall 2006	81	**70**		
Fall 2005	83	65	**59**	
Fall 2004	79	69	62	
Fall 2003	77	63	59	
Fall 2002	80	65	63	**56**
Fall 2001	82	67	61	51
Fall 2000	77	63	57	49
Fall 1999	73	60	54	44
Fall 1998	80	64	57	50
Fall 1997	77	64	55	46

Waterbury	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2007	**78**			
Fall 2006	76	**56**		
Fall 2005	77	60	**57**	
Fall 2004	81	62	56	
Fall 2003	79	64	55	
Fall 2002	66	53	42	**38**
Fall 2001	73	57	47	43
Fall 2000	72	54	47	35
Fall 1999	74	50	47	40
Fall 1998	80	58	46	43
Fall 1997	67	50	41	36

OIR/As of November 13, 2008

Table A8. University of Connecticut Most Recent Retention Rates and Graduation Rates for Entering Freshmen Classes by Ethnicity of Freshmen as of Fall 2008

Storrs Campus - Minority[1] Freshmen

Freshmen Entering Class:	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2007	**92**			
Fall 2006	91	**83**		
Fall 2005	91	85	**81**	
Fall 2004	93	82	77	
Fall 2003	89	82	77	
Fall 2002	88	78	75	**70**
Fall 2001	87	78	76	68
Fall 2000	89	79	77	69
Fall 1999	87	80	73	66
Fall 1998	88	80	75	67
Fall 1997	90	81	76	69

Total Five Regional Campuses - Minority[1] Freshmen

Freshmen Entering Class:	Retention After 1 yr.	2 year Retention	3 year Retention	Graduated in 6 yrs.
Fall 2007	**79**			
Fall 2006	80	**69**		
Fall 2005	83	64	**58**	
Fall 2004	78	64	60	
Fall 2003	81	74	63	
Fall 2002	81	65	61	**53**
Fall 2001	80	68	57	47
Fall 2000	72	64	55	44
Fall 1999	75	60	52	37
Fall 1998	77	59	55	47
Fall 1997	78	62	53	42

Table A9. Storrs Campus - Latest Retention and Graduation Rates by Ethnic Category

Rate	Entering Freshmen Class	Asian American	African American	Hispanic American	Native American[2]	All Minority[1]	Non ResAlien	White[3]	Total
Retention after 1 yr.	**Fall 2007**	**97**	**88**	**90**	**91**	**92**	**92**	**93**	**93**
Retention after 2 yr.	**Fall 2006**	**86**	**82**	**80**	**63**	**83**	**88**	**88**	**87**
Retention after 3 yrs.	**Fall 2005**	**86**	**75**	**80**	**100**	**81**	**85**	**87**	**86**
Graduated in 4 yrs.	**Fall 2004**	**64**	**43**	**54**	**58**	**54**	**61**	**68**	**66**
Graduated in 5 yrs.	**Fall 2003**	**81**	**57**	**66**	**62**	**68**	**59**	**78**	**76**
Graduated in 6 yrs.	**Fall 2002**	**79**	**59**	**70**	**50**	**70**	**76**	**76**	**76**

[1] Minority includes Asian American, African American, Hispanic American, and Native American.

[2] Entering freshmen classes of Native Americans have less than 15 students.

[3] White category includes self reported white, other, and "refused to indicate".

OIR/As of November 13, 2008

ATTACHMENT B

Quantitative Retention Analyses

B1. Storrs Campus Fall Freshman Class 2000-2007 Freshman Leaver Summaries
2.75 Cut Point for Voluntary Leave Profiles

Leave Status: The data for 2,223 Fall 2000-07 freshmen who left the Storrs Campus are summarized in this section of the report. As shown below, most students who left did so voluntarily, and in similar numbers for freshmen with total GPA < 2.75 and >= 2.75.

Three Grade Point Average Profiles were created:

- Involuntary Leavers 394 (18%)
- Voluntary Leavers with GPA < 2.75 927 (42%)
- Voluntary Leavers with GPA ≥ 2.75 902 (40%)

Gender: Significantly more men were dismissed. This is a large statistical effect. Significantly more women with GPA >= 2.75 left the Storrs campus.

	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.75	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.75
Men	**(48)**	**275 (70)**	475 (52)	334 (37)
Women	**(52)**	119 (30)	452 (48)	**568 (63)**

Minority Representation: Significantly more minority students left involuntarily.

Minority Representation	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.75	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.75
Non-Minority	(73)	243 (62)	636 (69)	689 (76)
Minority	**(18)**	**121(31)**	200 (21)	107(12)
Other	(9)	30 (7)	91 (10)	106 (12)

Ethnicity: More African-American and more Hispanic students left involuntarily.

	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.75	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.75
White	(73)	243 (62)	636 (69)	689 (76)
African-American	**(5)**	**53 (13.5)**	74 (8)	19 (2)
Hispanic	**(6)**	**51 (13)**	80 (9)	39 (4)
Asian/Pacific Islander	(6)	15 (4)	43 (4.5)	48 (5)
American Indian	(1)	2 (1)	4 (.1)	1 (.1)
NonResident/Alien	(1)	4 (1)	13 (1.5)	10 (1)
Not Indicated/Other	(8)	22 (5.5)	77 (8)	96 (11)

State Residence: Significantly more out-of-state students left voluntarily. The percentage was significantly higher for students with GPA > = 2.75 than for students with GPA < 2.75.

	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.75	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.75
In-State	(69)	280 (71)	511 (56)	438 (49)
Out-of-State	**(31)**	114 (29)	**404 (44)**	**462 (51)**

College/School: Slightly more Engineering students were dismissed. More students enrolled in the ACES program with GPA >= 2.75 left voluntarily.

	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.75	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.75
Agriculture	(3)	11 (3)	29 (3)	30 (3.5)
CLAS	(56)	227 (58)	530 (57)	462 (51)
Business	(10)	29 (7)	65 (7)	78 (9)
Engineering	**(10)**	**56 (14)**	77 (8)	45 (5)
Family Studies	(1)	2 (.1)	5 (.1)	0 (0)
Fine Arts	(3)	6 (1.5)	23 (3)	50 (5.5)
Nursing	(2)	4 (1)	18 (2)	19 (2)
ACES	**(15)**	59 (15)	179 (19)	**218 (24)**

INTD 180: Dismissed students and students who earned a GPA < 2.75 were less likely to have enrolled in INTD180. It also should be noted that students who were dismissed performed significantly below voluntary leavers and the freshman population as a whole.

Enrolled	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.75	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.75
Yes	(56)	199 (50.5)	447 (48)	487 (54)
No	**(44)**	**195 (49.5)**	**480 (52)**	415 (46)

Student Subpopulation Summary: More students enrolled in the CAP Program left involuntarily. More students who participated in athletics with GPA < 2.75 left voluntarily.

	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.75	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.75
None	(82)	314 (80)	732 (80)	758 (84)
Athlete	**(6)**	22 (5.5)	**112 (12)**	61 (7)
CAP Program	**(3)**	**48 (12)**	66 (7)	18 (2)
Honors Program	(8)	8 (2)	10 (1)	59 (6.5)
Athlete/CAP	(.5)	0 (0)	3 (.1)	1 (.1)
Athlete/Honors	(.5)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (.1)
Greek Organizations	(.1)	2 (.1)	4 (.1)	1 (.1)

B2. Regional Campus Fall Freshman Class 2000-2007 Freshman Leaver Summaries
2.50 Cut Point for Voluntary Leave Profiles

Leave Status: The data for 1,459 Fall 2000-07 freshmen who left the regional campuses are summarized in this section of the report. As at the Storrs campus, most students who left did so voluntarily, and of those shown below the majority left voluntarily with GPA < 2.50.

Three Grade Point Average Profiles were created:

- Involuntary Leavers 282 (19%)
- Voluntary Leavers with GPA < 2.50 710 (49%)
- Voluntary Leavers with GPA ≥ 2.50 467 (32%)

Gender: Over 8 years, slightly more men left involuntarily or with GPA < 2.50. By comparison, more women left voluntarily with GPA >= 2.50.

Gender	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.50	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.50
Men	**(51)**	**161 (57)**	**390 (55)**	209 (45)
Women	**(49)**	121 (43)	320 (45)	**258 (55)**

Minority Representation: Across 8 years more non-minority students left voluntarily with GPA >= 2.50.

Minority Representation	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.50	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.50
Non-Minority	**(59)**	157 (56)	444 (62.5)	**312 (67)**
Minority	(29)	96 (34)	200 (28)	80 (17)
Other	(12)	29 (10)	66 (9.5)	75 (16)

College/School: The majority of students enrolled at regional campuses were CLAS or ACES program students, and they left in slightly higher percentages than their norm involuntarily and with GPA < 2.50.

College/School	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.50	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.50
Agriculture	(3)	14 (5)	34 (5)	19 (4)
CLAS & ACES	(85)	254 (90)	621 (87.5)	398 (85)
Business	(3)	3 (1)	16 (2)	15 (3)
Engineering	(4)	5 (2)	17 (2)	15 (3)
Family Studies	(1)	2 (1)	2 (.1)	3 (.1)
Fine Arts	(1)	0 (0)	1 (.1)	5 (1.5)
Nursing	(3)	4 (2)	17 (2.5)	10 (2)

INTD 180: Across 8 years, enrollment in INTD 180 for all three leave status profiles was lower than the norm INTD 180 enrollment for the regional campuses. It should be noted that enrollment in this course of students who were dismissed was significantly below the population average. Similarly, enrollment of students who left voluntarily with GPA < 2.50 was below the population average, but the discrepancy was not as high as for students dismissed.

Enrolled	Norms	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers GPA < 2.50	Voluntary Leavers GPA ≥ 2.50
Yes	**(67)**	**151 (53.5)**	**394 (56)**	**236 (50.5)**
No	(33)	131 (46.5)	314 (44)	231 (49.5)

Other Notes: Leaver status data for SAT Mathematics and Verbal scores were consistent with the population norm, as were leave status profiles for students enrolled in the CAP Program.

B3. Storrs Campus Sophomore Leaver Summaries for Incoming Fall 2003-2006 Freshmen

Student Status Summary: The data summaries for 11,776 sophomores are presented in the next series of tables. The majority of students stayed (93%).

Student Status	Frequency of Students	Percent
Involuntary	217	2%
Voluntary	610	5%
Stay	**10,949**	**93%**

Gender: Significantly more men left involuntarily.

Gender	Norms %	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers	Stayers
Men	**46**	**150 (69)**	284 (46.5)	4,993 (46)
Women	54	67 (31)	326 (53.5)	4,547 (54)

Ethnicity: More African-American and more Hispanic students left involuntarily.

Ethnicity	Norms %	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers	Stayers
White	71	131(60)	431 (71)	7,750 (71)
African-American	**5**	**32 (15)**	39 (6.5)	549 (5)
Hispanic	**5**	**22 (10)**	48 (8)	492 (4.5)
Asian/Pacific Island.	8	15 (7)	38 (6)	816 (7.5)
American Indian	.5	1 (.1)	4 (.1)	34 (.1)
Non-Resident/Alien	.5	0 (0)	5 (.1)	81 (.1)
Not Indicated/Other	10	16 (7)	45 (7.5)	1,227 (11)

State Residence: Based on comparison to the population percentage, slightly more in-state students were dismissed. Significantly more out-of-state students left voluntarily.

Residence	Norms %	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers	Stayers
In-State	**71**	**170 (78)**	349 (57)	7,920 (72)
Out-of-State	**29**	47 (22)	**261 (43)**	3,029 (28)

Student Subpopulation: While the frequencies for dismissed students are very small, more students enrolled in the CAP program were dismissed.

Sub-population	Norms %	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers	Stayers
None	82	168 (77)	488 (80)	8,908 (81)
Athlete	7	18 (8)	72 (12)	665 (6)
CAP Program	**3**	**25 (11.5)**	27 (4)	373 (3.5)
Honors Program	8	4 (2)	19 (3)	969 (9)
Athlete/CAP	.5	2 (1)	4 (1)	9 (.1)
Athlete/Honors	.5	0 (0)	0 (0)	25 (.1)

GPA: Students who left voluntarily had significantly lower GPAs than those who stayed.

Year	Involuntary Leavers Mean	Voluntary Leavers Mean (SD)	Stayers Mean (SD)
Sophomore	**1.74**	2.69	3.10

B4. Regional Campus Sophomore Leaver Summaries for Incoming Fall 2003-2006 Freshmen

Student Status Summary: The majority of students stayed (n = 2,457; 80%).

Student Status	Frequency of Students	Percent
Involuntary	154	5
Voluntary	461	15
Stay	**2,457**	**80**

Gender: Slightly more men left involuntarily. Slightly more women left voluntarily.

Gender	Norms %	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers	Stayers
Men	**53**	**92 (60)**	221 (48)	1,291 (52.5)
Women	**47**	62 (40)	**240 (52)**	1,166 (47.5)

Ethnicity: Slightly more Hispanic students left involuntarily.

Ethnicity	Norms %	Involuntary Leavers	Voluntary Leavers	Stayers
White	57	88 (57)	281 (61)	1,363 (55.5)
Black	8	14 (9)	37 (8)	190 (8)
Hispanic	**10**	**23 (15)**	46 (10)	254 (10)
Asian/ Pacific Island.	12	10 (6.5)	43 (9)	289 (12)
American Indian	.1	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (.1)
NonResident/Alien	.1	0 (0)	0 (0)	26 (.1)
Not Indicated/Other	13	19 (12.5)	54 (12)	327 (13)

GPA: Average GPA for students who left voluntarily was below the averages for students who stayed.

Year	Involuntary Leavers Mean	Voluntary Leavers Mean (SD)	Stayers Mean (SD)
Sophomore	**1.52**	2.84	3.12

B5. Storrs Campus Leaver Summaries for Students Who Transferred to UConn
Fall 2005-2007 Incoming Classes

Status: Data summaries for 1,971 transfers to the Storrs Campus are reported below. Most stayed.

	Frequency of Students	Percent
Involuntary Leaver	37	2
Voluntary Leaver	243	12
Stayer	**1691**	**86**

Gender: Only 37 students left involuntarily in three years; however, the percent of men who left was greater than the norm percent for the Storrs campus.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
Men	**50**	**28 (76)**	116 (48)	846 (50)
Women	50	9 (24)	127 (54)	845 (50)

Incoming Academic Level: Most transfers enrolled as sophomores. The percent of freshman transfers dismissed was greater than the norm, as was the case for senior transfers who left voluntarily.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
Freshmen	**24**	**13 (35)**	51 (21)	369 (21)
Sophomores	**52**	14 (38)	114 (47)	970 (54)
Juniors	21	9 (24)	54 (22)	386 (22)
Seniors	**3**	1(3)	**24 (10)**	59 (3)

Minority Representation: While only 8 students, the percent of minority students who left involuntarily was greater than the population norm.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
Non-Minority	70	24 (65)	166 (68)	1152 (68)
Minority	**12**	**8 (22)**	22 (9)	204 (12)
Not Indicated	18	5 (13)	55 (23)	335 (20)

State Residence: The percent of out-of-state students who left was slightly greater than the norm.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
In-State	82	29 (78)	188 (77)	1423 (84)
Out-of-State	**18**	**8 (22)**	**55 (23)**	268 (16)

Transfer from 2-Year or 4-Year Institutions: Most transfers were from 4-year institutions. Also, while only 13 students, the percent of transfers from 2-year schools who were dismissed exceeded the norm.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
2-Year	**28**	**13 (35)**	73 (31)	447 (27)
4-Year	**72**	24 (65)	164 (69)	1191 (73)

Transfer from Public or Private Institutions: Most students transferred from public institutions. The percent of transfers from public institutions who left was greater than the norm.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
Public	**62**	**27 (73)**	**164 (69.5)**	999 (61)
Private	38	10 (27)	72 (30.5)	635 (39)

Transfer from In-State or Out-of-State Institutions: Most transfers were from out-of-state schools. Also, while only 19 students, the percent of transfers from in-state schools who left exceeded the norm.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
In-State Institution	**42**	**19 (51)**	98 (41)	657 (40)
Out-of-State Institution	**58**	18 (49)	142 (59)	969 (60)

B6. Regional Campus Leaver Summaries for Students Who Transferred to UConn Fall 2005-2007 Incoming Classes

Status: Data summaries for 945 transfers to the regional campuses are reported below. Most stayed. Most transfers enrolled in school full-time (67%). However, the percent of students who enrolled part-time at the regional campuses (33%) is significantly greater than the percent for the Storrs campus.

	Frequency of Students	Percent
Involuntary Leaver	9	1
Voluntary Leaver	218	23
Stayer	**718**	**76**

Gender: While only 6 students, the percent of men dismissed is above the norm for men who transferred.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
Men	**42**	**6 (67)**	84 (38.5)	301 (42)
Women	**58**	3 (33)	134 (61.5)	417 (58)

Incoming Academic Level: Most transfers enrolled as sophomores. While only 6 students, the percent of freshmen dismissed was higher than the norm. Also, more seniors left voluntarily than the norm.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
Freshmen	**27**	**6 (67)**	50 (23)	174 (24)
Sophomores	**37**	2 (22)	70 (32)	244 (34)
Juniors	28	1 (11)	66 (30)	238 (33)
Seniors	**8**	0 (0)	**32 (15)**	62 (9)

Minority Representation: While only 8 students, the percent of non-minority students dismissed was greater than the norm.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
Non-Minority	**63**	**8 (89)**	133 (61)	437 (61)
Minority	20	1 (11)	52 (24)	150 (21)
Not Indicated	17	0 (0)	33 (15)	131 (18)

Transfer from 2-Year or 4-Year Institutions: While only 7 students, the percent of transfers from 4-year institutions was greater than the norm.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
2-Year	40	1 (12.5)	80 (38)	312 (46)
4-Year	**60**	**7 (87.5)**	132 (62)	371 (54)

Transfer from Public or Private Institutions: Most students transferred in from public institutions.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
Public	**65**	3 (37.5)	133 (63)	466 (68.5)
Private	**35**	5 (62.5)	79 (37)	215 (31.5)

Transfer from In-State or Out-of-State Institutions: More students transferred from in-state schools.

	Norms %	Involuntary Leaver	Voluntary Leaver	Stayer
In-State Institution	**56**	4 (44)	112 (52)	418 (60)
Out-of-State Institution	**44**	5 (56)	102 (48)	275 (40)

B7. Storrs Campus Fall 2003 Incoming Freshman Class Who Graduated within Four Years

The data for 3,153 first-time full-time freshmen who enrolled in Fall 2003 at the Storrs campus were analyzed with respect to graduation status. A total of 1,908 students from this cohort (60.5%) graduated within four years. Their report summaries are presented below.

Demographic Characteristics

Gender: More females graduated within four years than expected based on norm percentages.

	Norm	Graduated within 4 Years
Male	**(46)**	**757 (40)**
Female	**(54)**	**1151 (60)**

Minority Representation: Percentages generally matched norm percentages.

	Norm	Graduated within 4 Years
Non-Minority	(75)	1477 (77)
Minority	(17)	267 (14)
Other	(8)	163 (9)

State Residence: Percentages for state residence matched norm percentages.

	Norm	Graduated within 4 Years
In-State	(71)	1336 (70)
Out-of-State	(29)	572 (30)

Student Subpopulation: Percentages generally matched norm percentages.

	Norm	Graduated within 4 Years
None	(83)	1582 (83)
NCAA Athlete	(7)	124 (6.5)
CAP Program	(2)	17 (1)
Honors Program	(8)	182 (9.5)
NCAA/Honors	(1)	3 (0.2)

Aptitude and Achievement Data

SAT: Average scores of students who graduated in four years were a bit higher but generally matched norm scores.

	Norm	Graduated within 4 Years
SATM	594	599
SATV	573	577

INTD 180 Enrollment: The percentage of students who had enrolled in INTD 180 and graduated in four years was slightly higher than the freshmen population but generally matched norm percentages.

	Norm	Graduated within 4 Years
Yes	(61)	1208 (63)
No	(39)	700 (37)

Advanced Standing*: Freshmen who graduated within four years entered with significantly more credits than the general freshman population. This distribution is skewed statistically, so credit categories were created and reported in the range table following this category. (*Status defined by students possessing Advanced Placement, Early College Experience, or other advanced credit approved by UConn).

	Norm Mean	Graduated within 4 Years
Number of credits	3.44	4.12

Advanced Standing* Ranges: Students who graduated within four years were more likely to have entered as freshmen with at least 6 credits than the general freshman population.

	Norm	Graduated within 4 Years
No credits	(62)	1089 (57)
1 to 5	(13)	239 (12)
6 to 12	**(17)**	**384 (20)**
13 or more	**(8)**	**196 (11)**

B8. Storrs Campus Fall 2003 Incoming Freshman Class Who Graduated within Four or More Years

The data for 3,153 first-time full-time freshmen who enrolled in Fall 2003 at the Storrs campus were analyzed with respect to graduation status. A total of 2,361 students from this cohort (75%) graduated in four or more years as of the beginning of Fall 2008. Their report summaries are presented below.

Demographic Characteristics

Gender: Percentages generally matched norm percentages.

	Norm	Graduated in 4 Years or More
Male	(46)	1014 (43)
Female	(54)	1347 (57)

Minority Representation: Percentages generally matched norm percentages.

	Norm	Graduated in 4 Years or More
Non-Minority	(75)	1810 (77)
Minority	(17)	369 (16)
Other	(8)	182 (8)

State Residence: Percentages for state residence matched norm percentages.

	Norm	Graduated in 4 Years or More
In-State	(71)	1701 (72)
Out-of-State	(29)	660 (28)

Student Subpopulation: Percentages generally matched norm percentages.

	Norm	Graduated in 4 Years or More
None	(83)	1952 (83)
NCAA Athlete	(7)	155 (7)
CAP Program	(2)	33 (1)
Honors Program	(8)	217 (9)
NCAA/Honors	(1)	4 (.2)

Aptitude and Achievement Data

SAT: Average scores of students who graduated in four or more years were a bit higher but generally matched norm scores.

	Norm	Graduated in 4 Years or More
SATM	594	598
SATV	573	577

INTD 180 Enrollment: The percentage of students who enrolled in INTD 180 and graduated in four or more years generally matched norm percentages.

	Norm	Graduated in 4 Years or More
Yes	(61)	1464 (62)
No	(39)	897 (38)

Advanced Standing: Freshmen who graduated in four or more years entered with significantly more credits than the general freshman population. This distribution is skewed statistically, so credit categories were created and reported in the range table following this category. (Note: The average number of credits (3.85) brought in by students graduating in four or more years are lower than the average (4.12) brought in by students who graduated within four years in Table B7).

	Norm Mean	Graduated in 4 Years or More
Number of credits	3.44	3.85

Advanced Standing Ranges: Frequencies and percentages of credits brought in by students who graduated in four or more years generally matched norm percentages.

	Norm	Graduated in 4 Years or More
No credits	(62)	1395 (60)
1 to 5	(13)	308 (13)
6 to 12	(17)	438 (19)
13 or more	(8)	220 (9)

B9. Regional Campus Fall 2003 Incoming Freshman Class Who Graduated within Four Years

The data for 854 first-time full-time freshmen who enrolled in Fall 2003 at a regional campus were analyzed with respect to graduation status. A total of 197 students from this cohort (23%) graduated within four years. Their report summaries are presented below.

Demographic Characteristics

Gender: More females graduated within four years than expected based on norm percentages.

	Norm	Graduated within 4 Years
Male	**(51)**	**80 (41)**
Female	**(49)**	**117 (59)**

Minority Representation: Percentages generally matched norm percentages.

	Norm	Graduated within 4 Years
Non-Minority	(62)	133 (68)
Minority	(20)	30 (15)
Other	(18)	34 (17)

Aptitude and Achievement Data

SAT: Average scores of students who graduated in four years were higher on average than expected.

	Norm	Graduated within 4 Years
SATM	514	528
SATV	504	522

INTD 180 Enrollment: The percentage of students who enrolled in INTD 180 and graduated in four years generally matched norm percentages.

	Norm	Graduated within 4 Years
Yes	(73)	141 (72)
No	(27)	56 (28)

Advanced Standing: Freshmen who graduated within four years entered with significantly more credits than the general freshman population. This distribution is skewed statistically, so credit categories were created and reported in the ranges table following this category. Also, the average amount of credits (1.34) for the entire cohort is low. Most students enrolled without any credits.

	Norm Mean	Graduated within 4 Years
Number of credits	1.34	1.84

Advanced Standing Ranges: Most students who graduated within four years did not bring in credit when they enrolled in Fall 2003.

	Norm	Graduated within 4 Years
No credits	**(62)**	**143 (73)**
1 to 5	(13)	30 (15)
6 to 13	(17)	24 (12)

B10. Regional Campus Fall 2003 Incoming Freshman Class Who Graduated within Four or More Years

The data for 854 first-time full-time freshmen who enrolled in Fall 2003 at the Storrs campus were analyzed with respect to graduation status. A total of 372 students from this cohort (44%) graduated in four or more years as of the beginning of Fall 2008. Their report summaries are presented below.

Demographic Characteristics

Gender: Percentages generally matched norm percentages.

	Norm	Graduated in 4 Years or More
Male	(51)	186 (50)
Female	(49)	186 (50)

Minority Representation: Percentages generally matched norm percentages.

	Norm	Graduated in 4 Years or More
Non-Minority	(62)	235 (63)
Minority	(20)	66 (18)
Other	(18)	71 (19)

Aptitude and Achievement Data

SAT: Average SATV scores of students who graduated in four or more years matched the norm average. SATM scores were slightly higher on average than the norm score.

	Norm	Graduated in 4 Years or More
SATM	**514**	**521**
SATV	504	510

INTD 180 Enrollment: The percentage of students who enrolled in INTD 180 and graduated in four or more years generally matched norm percentages.

	Norm	Graduated in 4 Years or More
Yes	(73)	279 (75)
No	(27)	93 (25)

Advanced Standing: Freshmen who graduated in four or more years entered with significantly more credits than the general freshman population. This distribution is skewed statistically, so credit categories were created and reported in the range table following this category. (Note: The average number of credits (1.85) brought in by students graduating in four or more years are about the same as the 1.84 brought in by students who graduated within four years in Table B9).

	Norm Mean	Graduated in 4 Years or More
Number of credits	1.34	1.84

Advanced Standing Ranges: Slightly more students who graduated in four or more years enrolled as freshmen with at least one advanced credit.

	Norm	Graduated in 4 Years or More
No credits	(77)	266 (71)
1 to 5	**(14)**	**62 (17)**
6 to 13	**(9)**	**44 (12)**

ATTACHMENT C

Freshman, Sophomore and Transfer Student Voluntary Leaver Phone Survey Results Storrs and Regional Campuses

Introduction

The University conducts an annual phone survey of students who choose not to return for the fall semester. Student employees interview students or parents of students who left voluntarily, asking them four open-ended questions: 1. What was your reason for leaving? 2. What could UConn have done better or differently? 3. What steps should UConn take to improve retention? 4. What are your plans (and if you are transferring to another institution where)? Responses are coded and placed into one of four categories: Environment, Academics, Personal, and Cost. Results of the surveys of freshman, sophomore, and transfer are discussed in this report.

STORRS CAMPUS FRESHMEN (2002-2006)

1. Respondent Summary

Incoming Fall Class	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	Total
Total Call List	247	252	213	187	159	196	**1,254**
Responded	180	164	146	114	90	145	**839**

- Table 1 above indicates a 74% response rate for voluntary freshman leavers this year.
- Over the six-year period, the response rate for this group has been 67%.

2. Storrs Campus Freshmen: Plans After Leaving UConn

Incoming Fall Class	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	Total
Transfer	133	132	112	100	80	81	636
Plan to Return	25	13	7	2	0	4	51
Employment	0	5	3	3	1	9	21
Military	3	0	2	1	0	5	11
Health	0	0	0	0	1	8	9
Attend Proprietary School	0	0	2	1	3	0	6
Taking Time Off	0	0	0	0	1	4	5

- Among leavers indicating their plans for this year, 73% were transferring to another school compared to 86% for the six-year period.
- The number of students leaving to seek employment was up this year.

3. Storrs Campus Freshmen: Institutional Destination, If Transferring

Incoming Fall Class	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	Total
Connecticut State University (CSU)	**16**	**24**	**20**	**12**	**10**	**6**	**88**
Central	6	11	6	4	3	1	31
Southern	9	4	5	3	5	2	28
Western	1	2	6	2	2	3	16
Eastern	0	7	3	3	0	0	13
Community Colleges	**8**	**12**	**9**	**3**	**5**	**6**	**43**
Manchester	3	5	1	0	0	1	10
Three Rivers	2	1	1	0	1	1	6
Capital	1	0	1	0	0	2	4
Gateway	1	1	0	1	0	1	4
Middlesex	1	1	1	0	1	0	4
Asnuntuck	0	1	1	0	1	0	3
Naugatuck Valley	0	1	2	0	0	0	3
Quinebaug Valley	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
Northwestern Conn.	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
Norwalk	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Housatonic	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Tunxis	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Other, with 5+ Transfer Students							
URI	5	1	1	6	3	4	20
UMass	5	4	3	1	2	3	18
Northeastern	5	3	1	2	3	1	15
Maine	0	3	1	3	4	2	13
State U. of New York (SUNY) School	1	5	3	2	2	0	13
BU	2	0	4	1	0	4	11
North Carolina	2	2	2	1	1	2	10
Rutgers	4	0	2	1	2	1	10
St. Joseph's	3	0	3	1	1	1	9
Cornell	0	1	1	3	2	1	8
Bridgewater State	1	2	0	2	1	1	7
Fairfield	2	3	2	0	0	0	7
New Hampshire	0	0	3	3	0	1	7
Quinnipiac	4	0	2	0	1	0	7
Suffolk	4	1	0	0	1	1	7
Indiana	3	0	2	0	0	1	6
NYU	0	2	1	0	2	1	6
Providence	1	1	3	0	0	1	6
Bryant	1	0	2	1	0	1	5
Delaware	1	1	1	0	1	1	5
Sacred Heart University	0	1	1	3	0	0	5
Vermont	0	0	2	0	0	3	5

- Over the six-year period, 88 respondents indicated they were transferring to CSU institutions and 43 indicated they were transferring to the state's community colleges.
- Institutions in the northeast dominated transfers going out-of-state: URI, UMass, Northeastern, Maine, a SUNY school or Boston University.

4. In-State Storrs Campus Freshmen: Reasons for Leaving

Incoming Fall Class	2002			2003			2004			2005			2006			2007			TOTAL		
	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All
Environment	**45**	**31**	**76**	**2**	**29**	**31**	**20**	**10**	**30**	**17**	**4**	**21**	**7**	**7**	**14**	**5**	**5**	**10**	**96**	**86**	**182**
Too Big	7	11	18	0	14	14	8	4	12	5	3	8	0	3	3	1	0	1	21	35	56
Too Far Away	10	10	20	2	1	3	3	1	4	1	1	2	3	1	4	0	1	1	19	15	34
Rural, Lack Town	8	1	9	0	5	5	6	0	6	5	0	5	2	0	2	1	2	3	22	8	30
Housing/Roommate	10	4	14	0	3	3	0	2	2	5	0	5	1	3	4	0	1	1	16	13	29
Too Much Partying	1	3	4	0	6	6	1	2	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	12	16
Too Close	6	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	9	0	9
Not Enough Activ.	3	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	0	5
Lack of Transp.	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Academic	**18**	**13**	**31**	**1**	**31**	**32**	**10**	**6**	**16**	**11**	**3**	**14**	**8**	**4**	**12**	**10**	**5**	**15**	**58**	**62**	**120**
Major Options	12	9	21	0	24	24	5	1	6	7	1	8	5	2	7	8	1	9	37	38	75
Lacked Challenge	4	0	4	1	3	4	2	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	10	3	13
Class Size	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	2	3	2	1	3	2	1	3	0	1	1	5	8	13
Advising	1	4	5	0	1	1	0	3	3	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	11
Overwhelmed Acad.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	3	0	4	4
Too Many Gen Ed	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
TA Engl. Proficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	2
Personal	**19**	**18**	**37**	**5**	**8**	**13**	**9**	**10**	**19**	**12**	**10**	**22**	**3**	**4**	**7**	**12**	**19**	**31**	**60**	**69**	**129**
Not Right Fit	11	9	20	4	5	9	5	4	9	8	6	14	2	4	6	1	3	4	31	31	62
Personal/Family	4	4	8	0	3	3	1	2	3	1	3	4	0	0	0	6	9	15	12	21	33
Military	2	3	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	1	3	0	0	0	2	3	5	7	9	16
Medical	2	2	4	1	0	1	2	2	4	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	3	4	8	7	15
Athletic Team	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	2	1	3
Cost	**10**	**11**	**21**	**1**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**5**	**6**	**0**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**6**	**4**	**10**	**19**	**25**	**44**
Affordability/Aid	10	11	21	1	3	4	1	5	6	0	2	2	1	0	1	6	4	10	19	25	44

- Students most often cited *environment-related* reasons for choosing to leave, followed by *personal* and *academic* reasons.
- The top specific reasons mentioned were *major options, wrong fit, campus size and location, and cost.*
- *Cost* was cited more in 2007 than the four previous years.

5. In-State Storrs Campus Freshmen: Things UConn Could Have Done Better or Differently

Incoming Fall Class	2002			2003			2004			2005			2006			2007			TOTAL		
	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All
Environment	**15**	**13**	**28**	**4**	**12**	**16**	**15**	**6**	**21**	**14**	**1**	**15**	**4**	**3**	**7**	**3**	**2**	**5**	**55**	**37**	**92**
Improve Dorm	2	5	7	0	4	4	6	2	8	4	1	5	1	1	2	0	0	0	13	13	26
More Activities	6	2	8	1	3	4	3	0	3	3	0	3	2	1	3	1	0	1	16	6	22
Smaller Univ. Feel	3	3	6	2	5	7	2	1	3	3	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	11	10	21
Freshman Parking	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	4	4	8
Transp. Off Campus	1	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	5
Frosh Live Together	2	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4
Improve Diversity	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Less Party Tolerance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	2
Food Quality	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	2
Academic	**13**	**7**	**20**	**4**	**21**	**25**	**11**	**8**	**19**	**11**	**5**	**16**	**5**	**6**	**11**	**2**	**2**	**4**	**46**	**49**	**95**
Indiv. Advising	6	6	12	3	9	12	3	6	9	4	3	7	1	3	4	0	0	0	17	27	44
Reduce Class Size	0	0	0	0	9	9	3	1	4	5	2	7	2	3	5	0	1	1	10	16	26
Better Quality Educ.	7	1	8	1	2	3	3	0	3	2	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	1	15	3	18
TA English Profic.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	3	1	4
Broaden Hon. Prog.	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Major Options	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
Cost	**5**	**3**	**8**	**0**	**2**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**1**	**4**	**8**	**8**	**16**
Reduce Tuition	5	3	8	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	8	8	16

Note: 26, 16 and 24 students responded *nothing* to things UConn could have done better or differently in the 3 most recent years.

- Suggestions regarding a*cademics* and the *environment* were cited most often and almost equally among things UConn could have done better.
- *Individual advising*, *reduce class size*, and *improve dorms* led all responses.

6. In-State Storrs Campus Freshmen: Steps UConn Should Take to Improve Retention

Incoming Fall Class	2002			2003			2004			2005			2006			2007			TOTAL		
	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All
Environment	**17**	**13**	**30**	**3**	**15**	**18**	**8**	**10**	**18**	**12**	**1**	**13**	**5**	**1**	**6**	**2**	**3**	**5**	**47**	**43**	**90**
More Frosh Supp Srv	3	4	7	2	2	4	2	4	6	2	1	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	9	12	21
Improve Hall Quality	2	4	6	0	6	6	1	2	3	4	0	4	2	0	2	0	0	0	9	12	21
More Campus Activ	5	2	7	0	3	3	2	2	4	2	0	2	1	0	1	1	1	2	11	8	19
Develop Location	3	0	3	0	2	2	2	0	2	3	0	3	1	0	1	0	1	1	9	3	12
On/Off Camp Transp	2	2	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	6
Freshman Parking	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	6
House Frosh Togeth.	2	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	4
Less Party Tolerance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
Academic	**8**	**7**	**15**	**5**	**14**	**19**	**11**	**6**	**17**	**12**	**2**	**14**	**6**	**4**	**10**	**3**	**5**	**8**	**45**	**38**	**83**
Reduce Class Size	4	5	9	3	10	13	7	2	9	5	0	5	3	2	5	1	3	4	23	22	45
Improve Advising	2	2	4	2	2	4	2	4	6	6	2	8	2	1	3	1	1	2	15	12	27
Broaden Honors Prog	2	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	1	6
TA Engl Proficiency	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	3
Acad Prog Avail	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	2
Cost	**2**	**2**	**4**	**0**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**0**	**5**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**1**	**4**	**6**	**11**	**17**
More Aid	2	2	4	0	2	2	1	1	2	0	5	5	0	0	0	3	1	4	6	11	17

Note: 16 and 22 students responded *nothing* to steps UConn should take to improve retention in the 2 most recent years.

- *Environment* and *academic-related* suggestions were cited most among types of steps UConn should take to improve retention.
- *Reducing class size* led all responses by far.

7. Out-of-State Storrs Freshmen: Reasons for Leaving UConn

Incoming Fall Class	2002			2003			2004			2005			2006			2007			TOTAL		
	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75+	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All
Environment	**20**	**23**	**43**	**16**	**15**	**31**	**24**	**7**	**31**	**24**	**4**	**28**	**23**	**5**	**28**	**14**	**5**	**19**	**121**	**59**	**180**
Too Far Away	8	5	13	4	4	8	10	3	13	6	2	8	6	1	7	6	1	7	40	16	56
Rural, Lack Town	5	5	10	0	4	4	6	4	10	6	0	6	8	3	11	2	3	5	27	19	46
Too Big	5	5	10	3	3	6	4	0	4	6	0	6	4	1	5	2	0	2	24	9	33
Housing/Roommate	2	7	9	5	1	6	2	0	2	3	1	4	3	0	3	2	0	2	17	9	26
Not Enough Activ.	0	0	0	3	2	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	5	3	8
Too Much Partying	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	2	5	2	7
Lack of Transp.	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Diversity Issues	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Too Close	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Academic	**3**	**6**	**9**	**5**	**12**	**17**	**5**	**2**	**7**	**7**	**3**	**10**	**9**	**2**	**11**	**8**	**8**	**16**	**37**	**33**	**70**
Major Options	3	3	6	2	6	8	4	1	5	6	2	8	5	2	7	4	3	7	24	17	41
Advising	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	3	3	6
Class Size	0	1	1	1	2	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	6
Lack Acad Challenge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	3	1	0	1	5	0	5
Overwhelmed Acad	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	4	4
Gen Ed Reqs	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
TA Engl. Proficiency	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
UC Not 1st Choice	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	0	2
Personal	**5**	**5**	**10**	**1**	**5**	**6**	**5**	**6**	**11**	**6**	**5**	**11**	**8**	**3**	**11**	**10**	**8**	**18**	**35**	**32**	**67**
Not Ready/Right Fit	2	4	6	0	4	4	3	2	5	4	4	8	7	3	10	2	1	3	18	18	36
Personal/Family	2	1	3	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	5	6	11	10	8	18
Medical	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	3	5	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	6	11
Athletic Team	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	0	2
Cost	**6**	**6**	**12**	**1**	**3**	**4**	**6**	**6**	**12**	**4**	**4**	**8**	**2**	**2**	**4**	**7**	**4**	**11**	**26**	**25**	**51**
Affordability/Aid	3	5	8	1	1	2	1	4	5	1	3	4	0	1	1	6	3	9	12	17	29
IS/OS Price Diff.	3	1	4	0	2	2	5	2	7	3	1	4	2	1	3	1	1	2	14	8	22

- Out-of-state freshmen who chose to leave indicated the environment as their primary reason.
- The most often cited reasons were *distance from home, rural location, cost, and major options.*
- *Cost* was cited more in 2007 than the three previous years.

8. Out-of-State Storrs Freshmen: Things UConn Could Have Done Better or Differently

Incoming Fall Class	2002			2003			2004			2005			2006			2007			TOTAL		
	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All
Environment	**16**	**8**	**24**	**5**	**9**	**14**	**13**	**4**	**17**	**15**	**1**	**16**	**14**	**2**	**16**	**8**	**4**	**12**	**71**	**28**	**99**
More Activities	6	2	8	2	2	4	4	3	7	5	0	5	10	0	10	4	2	6	31	9	40
Improve Dorm	2	4	6	1	2	3	3	0	3	2	0	2	0	1	1	2	0	2	10	7	17
Smaller University	3	1	4	0	1	1	2	1	3	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	7	4	11
House Frosh Togeth.	2	0	2	2	1	3	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	2	1	0	1	9	1	10
On/Off Camp Transp	1	0	1	0	1	1	3	0	3	2	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	1	7	2	9
More Frosh Parking	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	6
More Frosh Srvcs	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Less Partying	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
Improve Diversity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Food Quality	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Longer Orientation	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Academic	**2**	**4**	**6**	**9**	**14**	**23**	**8**	**3**	**11**	**11**	**2**	**13**	**7**	**3**	**10**	**1**	**4**	**5**	**38**	**30**	**68**
Individual Advising	2	3	5	2	7	9	5	2	7	8	2	10	4	3	7	0	3	3	21	20	41
Reduce Class Size	0	1	1	3	3	6	2	1	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	8	6	14
Better Quality Educ	0	0	0	4	2	6	1	0	1	1	0	1	3	0	3	0	0	0	9	2	11
TA Engl Proficiency	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Cost	**5**	**3**	**8**	**3**	**0**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**9**	**3**	**5**	**8**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**17**	**13**	**30**
Reduce Tuition	5	3	8	3	0	3	4	5	9	3	5	8	2	0	2	0	0	0	17	13	30

16, 28 and 28 students responded *nothing* to things we could have done better or differently in the 3 most recent years.

- Among things UConn could have done better or differently, out-of-state freshmen most often provided *environment-related* suggestions.
  Specific suggestions cited most often by out-of-state students were to provide students with *more individual attention from advisors* and *more activities.*

9. Out-of-State Storrs Freshmen: Steps UConn Should Take to Improve Retention

Incoming Fall Class	2002			2003			2004			2005			2006			2007			TOTAL		
	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All
Environment	**17**	**6**	**23**	**7**	**10**	**17**	**11**	**5**	**16**	**14**	**2**	**16**	**14**	**1**	**15**	**7**	**4**	**11**	**70**	**28**	**98**
More Frosh Supp Srv	3	1	4	4	4	8	3	0	3	2	0	2	4	0	4	3	0	3	19	5	24
More Campus Activ	5	2	7	1	0	1	2	3	5	2	0	2	6	0	6	1	0	1	17	5	22
On/Off Camp Transp	2	1	3	0	1	1	4	0	4	0	0	0	2	1	3	2	2	4	10	5	15
Develop Location	3	1	4	1	1	2	1	1	2	4	0	4	1	0	1	0	1	1	10	4	14
Improve Hall Quality	2	1	3	0	3	3	1	1	2	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	12
House Frosh Togeth.	2	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	5
More Orientation	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	3
Less Partying	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
More Frosh Parking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
On/ Off-Camp Jobs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Academic	**1**	**3**	**4**	**8**	**8**	**16**	**9**	**4**	**13**	**8**	**2**	**10**	**7**	**5**	**12**	**4**	**5**	**9**	**37**	**27**	**64**
Individual Advising	0	1	1	4	1	5	4	2	6	4	2	6	7	4	11	1	1	2	20	11	31
Reduce Class Size	1	2	3	4	6	10	4	2	6	3	0	3	0	0	0	2	3	5	14	13	27
TA Engl Proficiency	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	4
Program Availability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	2
Cost	**5**	**3**	**8**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**3**	**3**	**6**	**3**	**5**	**8**	**3**	**0**	**3**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**17**	**12**	**29**
More Aid	5	3	8	2	0	2	3	3	6	3	5	8	3	0	3	1	1	2	17	12	29

26 and 24 students responded "nothing" when asked what steps we should take to improve retention in the 2 most recent years listed

- Steps to improve retention cited by out-of-state freshmen most often related to the *environment.*
- However, the three most cited individual steps cited by out-of-state students include: *more individual advising, more financial aid,* and *reducing class size.*

STORRS CAMPUS SOPHOMORES (2004-2006 Incoming Freshman Classes)

10. Respondent Summary

Incoming Freshman Class	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Total
Total Call List	151	104	134	**389**
Responded	79	63	64	**206**

- Table 10 above indicates a 53% response rate over the 3-year period.

11. Storrs Campus Sophomores: Plans After Leaving UConn

Incoming Freshman Class	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Total
Transfer Total	69	55	38	124
Employment	5	7	3	12
Medical	0	0	11	11
Personal	0	0	10	10
Taking Time Off	2	0	1	2
Plan to Return	1	0	1	1
Proprietary School	0	1	0	1

- Among leavers indicating their plans for this year, 59% were transferring to another school compared to 77% for the three-year period.

12. Storrs Campus Sophomores: Institutional Destination, If Transferring

Incoming Freshman Class	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Total
CSU	**14**	**8**	**8**	**30**
Eastern	8	1	0	9
Southern	3	3	2	8
Central	1	3	4	8
Western	2	1	2	5
Community Colleges	**4**	**2**	**2**	**8**
Naugatuck Valley	2	1	0	3
Gateway	1	0	1	2
Three Rivers	0	1	1	2
Manchester	1	0	0	1
4 or More Transfer Students				
UMass- Amherst	2	3	4	9
UMass-Other Campuses	2	2	2	6
MA Coll of Pharmacy	1	5	0	6
Northeastern	2	2	1	5
Quinnipiac	2	2	1	5
SUNY Institutions	1	2	2	5
Maine	3	1	0	4
NYU	2	1	1	4

- Over three years, 30 sophomore leavers indicated they were transferring to CSU schools, 8 to Connecticut community colleges, 9 to UMass-Amherst and 6 to the other UMass campuses.
- Most transfers out-of-state opted for schools in the northeast.

13. Storrs Campus Sophomore Leaver Feedback

Reason for Leaving		*Could Have Done Better/Differently*		*Steps to Improve Retention*	
In-State Sophomores					
Environment	***29***		***21***		***21***
Rural / Lack of Town	10	Better/More Activities	13	Better/More Activities	7
Too Big	10	Improve Dorm	5	Develop Location	6
Too Far Away	5	Smaller University Feel	2	Greater Support Services	5
Housing	3	Better Off-Campus Transp.	1	Better Off-Campus Transportation	2
Too Much Partying	1			Better Parking	1
Academics	***36***		***35***		***33***
Major Options	24	Better Advising	19	Individual Attention from Advisors	19
Class Size	8	Better Quality Education	8	Reduce Class Size	13
Lack of Academic Challenge	2	Smaller Class Size	7	English Proficiency of TA's	1
Overwhelmed Academically	2	English Proficiency of TA's	1		
Personal	***34***				
Not Ready / Right Fit	17				
Medical	8				
Personal/Family Issues	8				
Employment	1				
Cost	***3***		***1***		***2***
Not Affordable	3	Reduce Cost	1	Reduce Cost/Increase Aid	2
Out-of-State Sophomores					
Environment	***14***		***11***		***13***
Rural / Lack of Town	4	Better/More Activities	6	Develop Location	4
Too Big	5	Improve Dorm	3	Greater Support Services	3
Too Far	3	Improve Diversity	1	More Activities	3
Diversity Concerns	1	Smaller Feel Needed	1	Increase Diversity	2
Too Much Partying	1			Improve Dorms	1
Academics	***32***		***38***		***25***
Major Options	27	Better Advising	21	More Attention from Advisors	18
Advising	3	Better Quality Education	13	Reduce Class Size	5
Academically Overwhelmed	2	Smaller Class Sizes	4	English Proficiency of TA's	2
Personal	***27***				
Not Ready / Right Fit	12				
Medical	5				
Personal Issues	5				
Athletic Teams	3				
Employment	2				
Cost	***20***		***13***		***15***
Financial Aid Issue	11	Reduce Tuition	11	More Financial Aid	12
In-State vs. Out-of-State Cost	9	Affordability	2	Affordability	3

51 students indicated *nothing could have been done better/differently*; 56 replied *nothing* to *steps to improve retention.*

Table 13 shows sophomores most often pointed to *academic* and *personal issues*. Prominently mentioned were *major options* and *improved advising.*

STORRS CAMPUS TRANSFER STUDENTS (2006 and 2007)

14. Respondent Summary

Incoming Class of:	Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Total
Total Call List	51	91	142
Responded	24	39	63

- The response rate for transfer student leavers was 44%.

15. Storrs Transfers: Plans After Leaving UConn

Incoming Class of:	Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Total
Transfer Total	14	20	34
Personal Issues	1	10	11
Employment	6	3	9
Medical	0	4	4
Plan to Return	2	1	3

- 56% of those indicating their plans were transferring to another institution.

16. Storrs Transfers: Institutional Destination

Incoming Class of:	Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Total
CSU	**4**	**8**	**12**
Central	2	3	5
Eastern	1	3	4
Southern	1	2	3
Manchester CC	**0**	**1**	**1**

Note: Also, twelve 2006 leavers transferred to 10 out-of-state schools in 2006 and 11 did so in 2007.

17. Storrs Campus Transfer Student Leaver Feedback

Reason for Leaving		*Could Have Done Better/Differently*		*Steps to Improve Retention*	
Environment	***12***		***5***		***4***
Too Big	6	Improve Dorm	4	Improve Dorm	2
Rural/Lack of Town	4	More Activities	1	Greater Support Services	1
Too Far	2			Better/More Activities	1
Academics	***20***		***13***		***15***
Major Options	12	Improve Advising	8	More Attention from Advisors	10
Advising	3	Better Quality Education	3	Reduce Class Size	5
Overwhelmed Academically	3	Reduce Class Size	2		
Study Abroad Opportunities	2				
Personal	***23***				
Personal/Family Issues	13				
Not Ready/Right Fit	4				
Medical	6				
Cost	***5***				
Not Affordable/Fin Aid Issues	5				

31students indicated *nothing could have been done better or differently*; 29 replied *nothing* to *steps to improve retention.*

- Transfers left due to personal/family issues or major options. Better advising also was recommended.

REGIONAL CAMPUS FRESHMEN (2002-2007)

18. Respondent Summary

Incoming Fall Class of:	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	Total
Total Call List	136	120	167	175	133	192	**731**
Responded	92	79	90	71	73	108	**405**

- This year's response rate (55%) was similar to the six-year overall rate of 56%.

19. Regional Campus Freshmen: Plans After Leaving UConn

Incoming Fall Class of:	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	Total
Transfer Total	56	39	52	51	41	70	309
Employment	15	5	2	12	12	15	61
Plan to Return to UConn	11	15	9	5	6	9	55
Military	2	0	1	1	4	4	12
Attend Proprietary School	1	0	4	0	5	1	11
Taking Time Off	0	0	2	0	5	4	11
Personal Issues	0	0	0	0	0	5	5

- Among leavers indicating their plans for this year, 65% were transferring to another school, similar to the 67% rate for the six-year period.
- Over the six-year period, 13% of leavers indicating their plans were seeking employment compared to only 3% of leavers at the Storrs campus.

20. Regional Campus Freshmen: Institutional Destination

Incoming Class of:	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	Total
CSU	**20**	**11**	**16**	**16**	**11**	**19**	**93**
Central	5	4	8	8	6	6	37
Southern	8	5	6	7	3	5	34
Western	5	1	1	1	2	5	15
Eastern	2	1	1	0	0	3	7
Community Colleges	**11**	**14**	**6**	**8**	**9**	**21**	**69**
Naugatuck Valley	2	3	3	3	1	4	16
Three Rivers	1	3	3	2	2	3	14
Manchester	2	2	3	0	2	2	11
Norwalk	2	1	2	1	0	1	7
Middlesex	0	2	0	1	3	0	6
Gateway	2	0	1	0	0	1	4
Tunxis	1	0	1	0	0	2	4
Housatonic	0	0	2	1	0	0	3
Northwestern Connecticut	0	0	1	0	1	1	3
Capital	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Quinebaug Valley	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Unspecified CT CC	0	0	0	0	0	7	7
6+ Transfer Students							
Northeastern	2	0	0	2	2	0	6
Quinnipiac	0	0	3	3	0	2	6

- Regional campus freshmen most often transferred to CSU or the community colleges.

21. Regional Campus Freshmen: Reasons for Leaving

Incoming Fall Class	2002			2003			2004			2005			2006			2007			TOTAL		
	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75+	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All
Environment	**16**	**12**	**28**	**10**	**10**	**20**	**8**	**14**	**22**	**8**	**3**	**11**	**7**	**5**	**12**	**6**	**10**	**16**	**55**	**54**	**109**
Too Far	5	6	11	2	6	8	3	10	13	2	1	3	1	3	4	3	3	6	16	29	45
Want Housing	5	2	7	0	0	0	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	6	14
Too Big	1	2	3	3	2	5	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	7	5	12
Too Close	3	0	3	1	1	2	0	1	1	2	0	2	1	0	1	2	0	2	9	2	11
Rural, Lack Town	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	1	1	2	3	1	4	0	0	0	6	4	10
Not Enough Activ	2	0	2	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	6	1	7
Lack of Transp	0	1	1	2	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	3	3	6
Disliked Reg Camp	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	4	4
Too Much Partying	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Academic	**8**	**6**	**14**	**12**	**7**	**19**	**13**	**9**	**22**	**12**	**7**	**19**	**11**	**5**	**16**	**16**	**14**	**30**	**72**	**48**	**120**
Major Options	7	6	13	10	7	17	12	6	18	7	7	14	8	2	10	13	9	22	57	37	94
Advising	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	1	2	3	0	3	3	1	4	0	1	1	9	3	12
Lacked Challenge	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	3	2	5
Class Size	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	3
Not First Choice	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	0	2
Overwhelmed Acad	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	2
TA Engl Proficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	2
Personal	**4**	**4**	**8**	**7**	**21**	**28**	**12**	**17**	**29**	**12**	**14**	**26**	**18**	**9**	**27**	**17**	**23**	**40**	**70**	**88**	**158**
Right Fit	0	0	0	3	14	17	8	11	19	9	7	16	13	6	19	6	9	15	39	47	86
Personal/Family	2	3	5	3	6	9	3	5	8	2	3	5	1	1	2	6	8	14	17	26	43
Military	2	1	3	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	4	2	1	3	9	7	16
Employment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	0	2	2	2	4	4	5	9
Medical	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	1	3	4
Cost	**5**	**7**	**12**	**2**	**6**	**8**	**2**	**8**	**10**	**6**	**6**	**12**	**6**	**4**	**10**	**4**	**8**	**12**	**25**	**39**	**64**
Not Affordable	1	3	4	2	4	6	1	7	8	5	4	9	4	2	6	4	8	12	17	28	45
Financial Aid Issue	4	4	8	0	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	3	2	2	4	0	0	0	8	11	19

- *Personal* reasons were most often cited by regional campus freshmen followed by *academic* and *environment* reasons.
- The four most often cited reasons were *major options, fit, cost,* and *distance from home.*

22. Regional Campus Freshmen: Things UConn Could Have Done Better or Differently

Incoming Fall Class	2002			2003			2004			2005			2006			2007			TOTAL		
	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All
Environment	**4**	**1**	**5**	**4**	**6**	**10**	**4**	**5**	**9**	**3**	**2**	**5**	**2**	**1**	**3**	**2**	**6**	**8**	**19**	**21**	**40**
Add Housing	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	2	2	2	1	3	0	0	0	2	3	5	6	7	13
More Activities	1	0	1	2	1	3	3	0	3	1	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	8	2	10
Smaller Univ Feel	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	5
Better/More Jobs	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3
Better Orientation	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Transp. Off Campus	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Food Quality	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	2
Better Parking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Improve Campus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
Wanted Storrs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
Academic	**2**	**4**	**6**	**6**	**5**	**11**	**15**	**11**	**26**	**14**	**10**	**24**	**14**	**5**	**19**	**11**	**6**	**17**	**62**	**41**	**103**
Individual Advising	1	2	3	4	4	8	10	5	15	4	4	8	8	1	9	2	4	6	29	20	49
Breadth of Classes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	11	5	2	7	7	1	8	17	9	26
Better Quality Educ	1	1	2	2	1	3	4	4	8	5	0	5	0	1	1	1	1	2	13	8	21
Smaller Class Size	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	2	2	4
TA Engl Proficiency	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Major Options	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
Cost	**3**	**1**	**4**	**2**	**4**	**6**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**5**	**4**	**9**	**3**	**2**	**5**	**0**	**5**	**5**	**14**	**18**	**32**
Reduce Tuition	3	1	4	2	4	6	1	2	3	5	4	9	3	2	5	0	5	5	14	18	32

Note: 28, 40 and 37 students responded *nothing* to things UConn could have done better or differently in the 3 most recent years.

- *Academic* suggestions were offered most often among things UConn could have done better.
- *Individual advising* led the way among specific items, followed by *reducing tuition.*

23. Regional Campus Freshmen: Steps UConn Should Take to Improve Retention

Incoming Fall Class	2002			2003			2004			2005			2006			2007			TOTAL		
	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All	2.75 +	< 2.75	All
Environment	**5**	**2**	**7**	**2**	**4**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**15**	**4**	**3**	**7**	**6**	**2**	**8**	**4**	**0**	**4**	**28**	**19**	**47**
Campus Activities	2	1	3	1	2	3	4	2	6	1	1	2	5	0	5	1	0	1	14	6	20
Frosh Support Srv	2	1	3	1	2	3	2	2	4	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	6	7	13
Housing at Reg's	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	1	1	2	0	2	4	2	6
Develop Location	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	2	5
Off Camp Transp	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
More Parking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Academic	**2**	**3**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**8**	**3**	**11**	**11**	**5**	**16**	**9**	**3**	**12**	**8**	**12**	**20**	**39**	**28**	**67**
Individual Advising	1	1	2	1	0	1	6	2	8	5	0	5	4	2	6	4	5	9	21	10	31
Breadth of Classes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	11	5	0	5	4	3	7	15	8	23
Class Size/Avail	1	2	3	0	2	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	6	8
TA Eng Proficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	3
Improve Ed Quality	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
Major Choice	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
Cost	**2**	**2**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**5**	**3**	**8**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**3**	**6**	**12**	**12**	**24**
Reduce Tuition	2	2	4	1	2	3	0	1	1	5	3	8	1	1	2	3	3	6	12	12	24

Note: 36, 47 and 62 students responded *nothing* to steps UConn should take to improve retention in the 3 most recent years.

- Most often mentioned steps to improve retention included: *more individual advising, reduce cost, offer greater breadth of classes and provide more campus activities.*

REGIONAL CAMPUS SOPHOMORES (2004-2006)

24. Respondent Summary

Incoming Class of:	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Total
Total Call List	99	107	115	**321**
Responded	41	57	53	**151**

- The response rate among sophomore voluntary leavers over the three-year period was 47%.

25. Regional Campus Sophomores: Plans After Leaving UConn

Incoming Freshman Class of:	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Total
Transfer Total	28	40	39	107
Employment	7	8	6	21
Plan to Return	1	3	5	9
Military	3	2	0	5
Proprietary School	1	3	0	4
Taking Time Off	1	1	0	2
Personal Issues	0	0	2	2

- Among respondents during the three-year period indicating their plans, 71% were transferring to another institution.

26. Regional Campus Sophomores: Institutional Destination

Incoming Class of:	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Total
CSU	**13**	**11**	**21**	**45**
Central	5	5	9	19
Southern	4	1	6	11
Western	2	3	5	10
Eastern	2	2	1	5
Community Colleges	**2**	**9**	**8**	**18**
Naugatuck Valley	1	4	4	9
Manchester	0	2	1	3
Norwalk	1	0	2	3
Housatonic	0	1	0	1
Three Rivers	0	1	1	1
Tunxis	0	1	0	1
3 or More Transfer Students				
Quinnipiac	1	3	1	5
U New Haven	1	1	1	2

- Like freshmen at the regional campuses, sophomores were likely to transfer to CSU schools or the community colleges.

27. Regional Campus Sophomore Leaver Feedback

Reason for Leaving		*Could Have Done Better/Differently*		*Steps to Improve Retention*	
Environment	***28***		***8***		***7***
Too Big	9	Offer Housing	6	Better/More Activities	3
Too Far	9	Improve Diversity	1	Offer Housing	2
No Housing	3	Better Off-Campus Transp.	1	Greater Freshman Support Services	1
Did not want to go to Storrs	3			Less Partying	1
Too Close	2				
Not Friendly	1				
Too Much Partying	1				
Academics	***57***		***49***		***53***
Major Options	43	Greater Breadth of Classes	20	Individual Advising	27
Class Size	4	Better Advising	16	Greater Breadth of Classes	22
Overwhelmed Academically	4	Smaller Class Size	6	Reduce Class Size	4
Advising	3	More Individual Attention	5		
Lack of Academic Challenge	3	Better Quality Education	2		
Personal	***13***				
Not Right Fit	6				
Personal/Family Issues	4				
Employment	2				
Medical	1				
Cost	***21***		***19***		***19***
Not Affordable	20	Reduce Tuition	17	Not Affordable	10
Financial Aid Issue	1	Financial Aid Issue	2	Financial Aid Issue	9

41 students indicated *nothing could have been done better/differently* and 40 replied *nothing* to *steps to improve retention.*

- Regional campus sophomore voluntary leavers most often pointed to academics when citing reasons for leaving or providing suggestions for improvement.
- Prominently mentioned suggestions related to *major options, individual advising, greater breadth of class offerings,* and *affordability.*

REGIONAL CAMPUS TRANSFER STUDENTS (2006-2007)

28. Respondent Summary

Incoming Class of:	**Fall 2006**	**Fall 2007**	**Total**
Total Call List	45	70	115
Responded	21	29	50

- The response rate among regional campus transfer student voluntary leavers over the two year period was 43%.

29. Regional Campus Transfers: Plans After Leaving UConn

Incoming Class of:	Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Total
Transfer Total	10	10	20
Employment	5	9	14
Plan to Return	4	6	10
Personal	1	4	5
Medical	0	2	2
Military	0	1	1

- 21 of the 52 leavers over two years transferred, 14 opted for employment and 10 planned to return.

30. Regional Campus Transfers: Institutional Destination

Incoming Class of:	Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Total
CSU	**4**	**4**	**8**
CCSU	2	2	4
SCSU	2	0	2
WCSU	0	2	2
CT Community Colleges	**3**	**2**	**5**
Capital CC	2	0	2
Manchester CC	1	0	1
Middlesex CC	0	1	1
Norwalk CC	0	1	1
Other Institutions			
Sacred Heart	0	2	2
Appalachian State	1	0	1
Delaware State	0	1	1
Harvard	1	0	1
Nichols	0	1	1
U South Florida	1	0	1

- Sixteen of the 21 regional campus transfers were attending institutions in-state.

31. Regional Campus Transfer Student Leaver Feedback

Reason for Leaving		*Could Have Done Better/Differently*		*Steps to Improve Retention*	
Environment	***7***		***3***		***1***
Too Far Away	2	Offer Housing at Regionals	3	Better/More Activities	1
Too Big	2				
Offer Housing at Regionals	2				
Lack of Transp. Off-Campus	1				
Academics	***23***		***25***		***24***
Major Options	15	Individual Advising	13	Greater Breadth of Classes	18
More Transf. Credits Accepted	4	Greater Breadth of Classes	12	More Indiv. Advising Attention	6
General Education Courses	2				
Greater Breadth of Classes	2				
Personal	***35***				
Not Ready/Right Fit	13				
Employment	8				
Personal/Family	6				
Military	4				
Time Off	2				
Medical	2				
Cost	***12***		***3***		***5***
Not Affordable / Fin. Aid Issue	12	Not Affordable / Fin. Aid Issue	3	Not Affordable / Fin. Aid Issue	5

28 students indicated *nothing could have been done better/differently* and 28 replied *nothing* to *steps UConn should take.*

- Leavers pointed to *major options, fit, individual advising,* and *greater breadth of classes.*

ATTACHMENT D

2007 UConn Entry Level Survey

Introduction: Obtaining early feedback from students, and at selected intervals during their undergraduate matriculation, is essential to meeting their needs as they progress along the enrollment curriculum through and beyond graduation. With this in mind, the Division of Enrollment Management administers the *Survey of Entry Level Students* to incoming freshmen during Orientation to gain insights into students' expectations as they near their first fall semester. This survey, previously completed and coded manually, is now a web-based survey which students complete on-line and whose responses are tabulated electronically. The survey, now administered every other year, garnered responses from 2,667 incoming Storrs freshmen in May and June of 2007. Additional annual response rates are provided below, as well as a set of key questions posed in the *Entry Level Survey.*

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2007
Number of Respondents	2,328	2,561	2,539	2,318	2,325	2,823	2,667

Key Questions:

- How important were selected factors in your decision to attend UConn?
- Which information sources did you or your family use to get information about UConn either before or after you applied? How would you rate the sources you used?
- What types of information did you research on the UConn web site before you applied and after you decided to attend UConn?
- What is the one thing you are looking forward to *most & least* about attending UConn?
- Looking ahead to your first year at UConn, how easy or hard do you think it will be to do the following?

A. Decision to Attend: Incoming freshmen were asked to rate the impact that selected factors had on their decision to attend the University of Connecticut on a scale ranging from *extremely, very* or *somewhat important* to *not very* or *not at all important.* Table 1 on the following page indicates new students' top reason for choosing to attend UConn were its being *a good educational value*, followed by *preparation for a job* and our *outstanding faculty*. Other top factors included *academic reputation, extracurricular opportunities, facilities, course breadth, graduate school preparation, cost, and academic department reputation*. These findings are consistent with results of the The American Freshman: National Norms Survey for Fall 2006. The top two factors influencing college choice based on 271,441 responses to UCLA's Higher Education Research Institute Survey were *academic reputation* and *graduates getting good jobs.*

1. Factors Affecting Your Decision to Attend UConn									
	2003			2005			2007		
	Extremely/ Very	Somewhat	Not Very/ Not at All	Extremely/ Very	Somewhat	Not Very/ Not at All	**Extremely/ Very**	Somewhat	Not Very/ Not at All
UConn good educational value	97	3	0	95	4	1	**95**	5	0
Preparation for a job	87	10	3	87	10	4	**87**	10	3
Outstanding faculty	82	16	3	83	14	3	**83**	14	3
Academic reputation	76	20	3	77	19	5	**81**	17	3
Extracurricular opportunities	75	21	4	76	19	5	**81**	16	3
University facilities	77	21	2	76	20	4	**80**	17	3
Wide variety of courses	80	17	4	78	17	4	**80**	16	3
Preparation for grad/prof school	75	18	7	76	17	8	**76**	17	7
Cost of attending	72	20	9	70	20	11	**69**	21	10
Academic rep. of a dept or program	66	25	11	65	23	12	**64**	24	12
Campus visit before orientation	53	30	17	53	28	19	**60**	23	17
Study abroad/internship opp's	52	28	21	56	26	18	**57**	27	13
Undergrad research opportunities	59	32	10	58	31	12	**55**	32	14
Scholarships/financial aid	58	23	20	54	23	23	**47**	24	29
Rec. by family/teacher/counselor	41	39	20	43	38	19	**46**	36	17
Information provided on the web	39	39	23	44	35	22	**44**	38	18
Intercollegiate athletics	39	29	32	44	26	29	**44**	24	32
Descriptive materials from UConn	40	44	15	41	41	18	**38**	45	17
Distance from home	40	41	20	41	39	20	**35**	42	22
Size of classes	41	44	14	43	42	15	**33**	47	19
Previous contact w/current students	34	32	35	35	32	34	**32**	32	36
Number of credits UConn accepted	31	31	38	36	29	35	**27**	30	43
Cultural diversity of student body	21	38	41	22	33	45	**25**	35	40
Previous contact with UConn grad	25	31	44	27	31	43	**19**	28	52
Cultural diversity of faculty/staff	29	32	40	29	27	44	**18**	32	51
Friends are here	17	28	55	20	28	53	**17**	29	54

B. Information Sources: Students were asked how often they used various information sources (a lot, some, or not) and how they would rate the sources they used (excellent, good, fair, or poor). Table 2, below, indicates that *our website* was the students' primary information source, followed by *campus tours* and *current/former students*. Table 3 shows the same three sources also receiving the highest marks for satisfaction. These data reflect recent years' efforts with regard to the website, orientation, and the Visitors Center. The high rank of current/former students being utilized as an information resource by prospects is yet another benefit of having satisfied students and graduates. They are important ambassadors for the University! Our findings are supported by results of a study involving 7,867 students from 20 four-year institutions conducted by Eduventures higher education consulting group released in March 2007. Their study also reported the *college web site* as the leading information source. Personal recommendations were cited as the next most utilized in the Eduventures study followed by campus visits and view books. Table 2 indicates our students citing *campus visits* as a leading information source, as well as personal recommendations from three groups: *current/former students, high school guidance counselors, and high school teachers.* Unlike Eduventures, though, *college publications* were not ranked as high use sources.

2. Information Source Used									
	2003			2005			2007		
	A lot	Some	Didn't Use	A lot	Some	Didn't Use	A lot	Some	Didn't Use
Internet/Web	51	41	8	58	36	6	**66**	30	3
UConn Tour	33	47	20	39	42	20	**43**	39	18
Current/Former Students	35	43	23	36	41	23	**37**	44	19
HS Guidance Counselors	25	49	26	24	51	25	**32**	50	19
HS Teacher	14	36	50	14	37	49	**18**	42	40
UConn Publications	19	51	30	17	47	35	**12**	57	31
College Fair	11	37	53	11	39	50	**12**	42	46
Newspapers/Magazines	5	29	66	6	27	67	**8**	41	51
UConn Staff	7	28	65	8	30	63	**6**	34	60
UConn Faculty	6	24	70	6	27	68	**6**	29	65
Radio/TV	3	19	78	3	19	78	**3**	21	76

The results in Table 3 are consistent with a recent industry survey indicating campus visits as students' most trusted source of information, followed by college web sites, and personal recommendations (Eduventures, 2006). Although our survey did not ask that specific question, assuming trust and satisfaction are congruent emotions, high satisfaction ratings accorded to the UConn tour, current/former students, and our web site support their findings.

3. Information Source Rating									
	2003			2005			2007		
	Excellent/ Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent/ Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent/ Good	Fair	Poor
UConn Tour	91	8	1	91	8	1	**92**	8	0
Current/Former Students	89	9	1	91	8	1	**91**	9	0
Internet/Web	88	11	1	90	9	1	**90**	9	1
UConn Staff	87	11	2	86	12	2	**88**	12	0
UConn Faculty	87	12	2	87	11	2	**87**	13	0
UConn Publications	88	11	0	87	12	0	**84**	17	0
HS Teacher	81	18	2	78	19	3	**80**	18	2
College Fair	73	24	3	74	23	3	**77**	21	2
HS Guidance Counselors	75	21	4	75	22	4	**74**	22	4
Newspaper/Magazines	71	26	2	72	26	2	**71**	27	2
Radio/TV	68	29	3	69	29	3	**63**	33	3

Table 4 lists types of information students most often access on our website prior to applying and after deciding to attend. *Majors/fields of study* top the list of type of information most often accessed before applying. *Statistical information* (e.g., acceptance rate) ranks second followed by *costs, course listings, and extracurricular activities.* Regarding information most often accessed after deciding to attend, *residence hall information* is first, followed by *orientation, and New Husky,* a recently implemented information resource for incoming students being accessed at a growing rate. Results from the aforementioned Eduventures study that asked students performing their college search what types of information they access on institutional web sites were similar to our "before applying" results. Academic programs/majors topped their list, followed by admissions profiles and requirements, financial aid information, and extracurricular activities.

4. Type of Information Most Often Accessed on the UConn Website

Before Applying	**2003**	**2005**	**2007**	***After Deciding to Attend***	**2003**	**2005**	**2007**
Majors (fields of study)	47	46	**53**	Residence Halls/Dorms/Housing	48	38	**35**
Statistical info (acceptance rate)	23	35	**34**	Orientation	18	26	**29**
Tuition/Cost/Fees	19	23	**24**	New Husky	3	3	**17**
Course listing (classes)	26	19	**21**	Course listing (classes)	22	19	**16**
Activities/social events/extracurricular	16	19	**21**	Activities/social events/extracurricular	10	15	**16**
Residence Halls/Dorms/Housing	24	19	**16**	Majors (fields of study)	13	12	**15**
Campus Info (directions, maps)	12	15	**16**	General Information	19	27	**14**
Athletics (intramural sports)	12	13	**16**	Important Dates/Deadlines	6	7	**13**
Application Process (Acad Req)	15	17	**14**	Financial Aid	11	8	**11**

C. Anticipation: Students' responses to what they were looking forward to most and least about attending UConn reflect cognitive dissonance long held as common to freshman adjustment. Although *meeting new people* was what students look forward to most, dorm life ranked second as to what they were looking forward to least, and though students were least looking forward to *academic workload,* this ranked second with regard to what they were looking forward to most. *Dorm life, campus size, location, distance from home, and missing home* being among the things students look forward to least may foreshadow our survey findings that point to campus environment, e.g., campus location, size, and life in rural Storrs as key reasons for leaving.

5. What Incoming Freshmen are Looking Forward to Most and Least

Most	**2003**	**2005**	**2007**	**Least**	**2003**	**2005**	**2007**
Meeting new people	28	27	**21**	Academics	30	37	**33**
Academics	10	15	**16**	Dorm life	13	13	**11**
Social Life /Extracurricular Activities	10	9	**12**	Campus size / spread out	6	11	**11**
New experiences / College life	16	13	**11**	Distance from home / location	7	5	**9**
Sports	7	12	**11**	Missing home / friends	9	8	**8**
Independence	10	12	**9**	Transition / starting over	6	4	**4**

D. Expectations: Students were asked how *easy* or *hard* it will be during their first year to acclimate to various components of the college experience. They responded that *getting involved in extracurricular activities* and *making friends and fitting in* would be somewhat or very easy as would *receiving accurate information about degree requirements, and personal counseling if needed. Getting good grades, adjusting to having some classes taught by international teaching assistants, and finding your way around campus* ranked at the bottom of things students believed would be somewhat or very easy to do. These findings regarding adjustment expectations are particularly significant in light of Tinto's long-standing assertion that academic and social integration are both key to student persistence and success. He goes on to stress that it is the institution's responsibility to provide opportunities for students to succeed in doing so. At UConn, adjustment is addressed by providing an informative, user-friendly New Husky website for new enrollees, a comprehensive orientation program for freshmen and their parents, and a Freshman Year Experience program providing course work and support during students' early transition to facilitate this important successful academic and social integration. The literature regarding student persistence supports the importance of academic advising, even to the extent of it being referred to as the cornerstone for retention. Results below indicate that incoming freshmen expect quality advising to be easily available. Funding in recent years for additional faculty and advisors has helped address this issue but it continues as an ongoing challenge.

6. Adjustment Expectations

	2003		2005		2007	
	Very or Somewhat:		Very or Somewhat:		Very or Somewhat:	
How easy or hard it will be to:	Easy	Hard	Easy	Hard	Easy	Hard
get involved in extracurricular activities	90	10	91	10	**93**	7
make friends and fit in	87	13	87	14	**87**	14
get accurate info about degree requirements	84	16	85	15	**86**	14
get other counseling (not career) if needed	82	18	83	18	**85**	15
get to know faculty or staff person who will care about your success	71	29	72	28	**76**	24
register for the classes you'll need	75	24	78	23	**72**	28
get enough time with your academic advisor	64	36	66	34	**72**	28
be treated like a person, not a number	66	34	67	33	**71**	29
find your way around campus	55	45	56	44	**59**	41
adjust to having some classes taught by international assistants	53	48	51	48	**59**	41
get good grades	52	48	49	52	**47**	54

E. Conclusion: We will continue assessing incoming freshman expectations and administering student satisfaction surveys. Understanding the student mindset early on helps us meet their needs, communicate mutual expectations and responsibilities, and achieve an optimal educational experience.

ATTACHMENT E

UConn Spring 2006 Student Satisfaction Mid-Career and Senior Survey

Introduction

Research shows that schools with higher levels of satisfaction have higher graduation rates, lower loan default rates, and higher alumni giving rates. Assessing student satisfaction provides information to guide strategic planning, retention initiatives, marketing and recruitment.

Survey Descriptions

In Spring 2006, on behalf of the Division of Enrollment Management, the Center of Survey and Research Analysis (CSRA) administered the *Mid-Career Student Survey* to a random sample of sophomores and juniors for the fourth consecutive year. At the same time, the *Seniors Survey* (same survey containing some additional pertinent items) was administered to seniors by CSRA for the third consecutive year. About 1,000 students responded each year to the mid-career survey and about 425 students responded each year to the senior survey.

Mid-Career and Senior Satisfaction Survey Responses

Advising: While sophomore and junior satisfaction with academic advising showed little change between 2003 and 2006, senior satisfaction with academic advisors increased from 2004 to 2005 but came back to 2004 levels in 2006.

1. Student Satisfaction with Advising

	2003			2004			2005			2006		
Sophomores and Juniors	**M**	**S**	**L**	**M**	**S**	**L**	**M**	**S**	**L**	**M**	**S**	**L**
Care about your academic success & welfare	59	17	24	63	14	23	60	17	23	63	14	22
Provide accurate info about requirements	64	14	23	66	13	20	65	15	20	64	14	22
Offer useful info about selecting courses	58	15	27	62	14	25	59	16	25	58	16	26
Provide career counseling/advice	54	17	29	58	19	22	55	19	25	58	16	27
Seniors				**M**	**S**	**L**	**M**	**S**	**L**	**M**	**S**	**L**
Care about your academic success & welfare				54	16	31	59	13	28	53	14	33
Provide accurate info about requirements				56	15	29	58	13	29	56	12	33
Offer useful info about selecting courses				48	17	35	58	11	31	49	15	38
Provide career counseling/advice				49	15	36	54	15	31	49	15	37

M = 7, 6, 5; More than Satisfied; S = 4 Satisfied; L = 3, 2, 1 = Less than Satisfied

Course Availability: Responses to "In general, how satisfied are you with the availability of the courses that you need?" indicated that 70% of sophomores and juniors and 76% of seniors were satisfied or more than satisfied with course availability. However, responses regarding individual aspects of course availability of major and general education courses were more mixed. Major courses seemed to be a bit less available than general education courses, particularly for sophomores and juniors.

2. Course Availability													
		2003			2004			2005			2006		
Sophomores and Juniors		**N**	**M**	**O**	**N**	**M**	**O**	**N**	**M**	**O**	**N**	**M**	**O**
Major courses:	not being offered	47	13	40	40	15	44	45	9	46	42	12	45
	closed	38	10	52	31	10	59	39	9	52	34	11	55
	conflicted with other classes	30	13	57	24	12	65	31	13	56	30	14	57
	at an inconvenient time	42	18	38	39	16	45	40	16	43	39	15	47
Gen Ed courses:	not being offered	55	13	32	55	16	29	57	11	32	56	13	31
	closed	42	11	47	42	11	47	45	12	42	48	13	41
	conflicted with other classes	35	14	51	36	12	52	34	17	49	42	16	43
	at an inconvenient time	51	12	37	53	13	34	56	13	31	49	17	33
Seniors					**N**	**M**	**O**	**N**	**M**	**O**	**N**	**M**	**O**
Major courses:	not being offered				49	12	38	49	11	40	45	14	42
	closed				42	9	49	52	10	40	48	11	42
	conflicted with other classes				30	12	58	36	10	53	36	13	50
	at an inconvenient time				45	19	37	42	20	39	49	16	36
Gen Ed courses:	not being offered				56	12	33	56	13	31	55	12	33
	closed				46	12	43	52	13	35	47	16	38
	conflicted with other classes				33	14	53	40	13	48	36	17	47
	at an inconvenient time				50	12	38	59	12	30	48	17	35

Scale of 1 to 7= Not at All to Very Often; N = Not Often; M = Middle, O = Often

Registering using PeopleSoft: Table 3 shows that ratings of sophomores/ juniors and seniors were quite similar, with 4 out of 5 students indicating they were satisfied or more than satisfied.

3. Course Registration Using PeopleSoft													
	2003			2004			2005			2006		
Sophomores and Juniors	**M**	**S**	**L**	**M**	**S**	**L**	**M**	**S**	**L**	**M**	**S**	**L**
Registering on-line using PeopleSoft	58	19	24	56	16	27	64	17	18	63	18	19
Seniors				**M**	**S**	**L**	**M**	**S**	**L**	**M**	**S**	**L**
Registering on-line using PeopleSoft				58	17	26	67	16	18	66	15	20

M = 7, 6, 5 More than Satisfied; S = 4 Satisfied; L = 3, 2, 1 Less than Satisfied

Seniors' Responses to Additional Survey Questions: Eight out of ten seniors expected to graduate in 4 years when they first enrolled at UConn, and 58% indicated they would be doing so compared to UConn's most recent actual four-year graduation rate of 54%. Changing majors or adding a second degree or major was the most frequently cited reason for taking longer. Three of four seniors indicated they would choose UConn if they had to start over and would recommend UConn to others.

4. Looking Back	2004	2005	2006
When I began my career at UConn I expected to graduate in 4 years	75	72	80
I will graduate in 4 years	55	52	58
I took longer because I changed my major or added second major or degree	29	37	37
If I could start all over again, I would still choose to attend UConn	77	78	75
I would recommend UConn as a top choice to someone applying to college	75	76	74

56% of seniors plan to go to work and 36% plan to attend graduate school upon graduation.

5. Career Plans	2004	2005	2006
Go to work	62	58	56
Go to graduate/professional school	29	38	36
Work and attend graduate/professional school	0	0	2
Something else	9	4	6

Most students were more than satisfied with their overall experience and academic experience, and most indicated their education prepared them for graduate school or employment.

6. How Satisfied Are You . . .	2004			2005			2006		
	M	S	L	M	S	L	M	S	L
With your overall experience at UConn	77	11	13	74	13	13	75	13	13
With your academic experience at UConn	71	17	13	72	20	7	74	15	11
That your UConn education helped you:									
Prepare you for graduate/professional school	67	15	18	67	15	17	72	13	16
Prepare you for employment	60	21	19	66	13	22	65	16	21
Develop spoken communication skills	65	18	17	65	14	22	64	17	18
Develop writing skills	60	23	18	60	20	20	61	17	22
Develop computer skills	53	19	28	57	17	26	50	21	30

M = 7, 6, 5 More than Satisfied; S = 4 Satisfied; L = 3, 2, 1 Less than Satisfied

Most UConn students indicated it was easy to make friends with other students, and about 2/3 felt it was easy to get involved in campus life and get good grades.

7. How Easy Has the Following Been to Achieve?	2004			2005			2006		
	M	E	L	M	E	L	M	E	L
Make friends with other students	79	12	9	74	15	11	80	10	10
Get involved in co-curricular activities	61	18	21	65	14	22	66	14	20
Get good grades	58	24	18	55	25	19	64	19	17
Be treated as a person and not just a number	40	18	42	47	17	35	49	14	36

M = 7, 6, 5 More than easy; E = 4 Easy; L = 3, 2, 1 Less than Easy

The majority of seniors were more than proud to be a graduate of UConn; less than half indicated they were more than likely to keep in touch with UConn after graduation; and, only 28% responded that they were more than likely to join the UConn Alumni Association.

8. Pride and Involvement:									
	2004			2005			2006		
	M	P/L	L	M	P/L	L	M	P/L	L
How proud are you to be a graduate of UConn?	78	13	8	78	11	11	76	11	13
How likely are you to remain in touch with UConn after graduation?	52	18	30	47	19	35	44	17	38
How likely are you to join the UConn Alumni Association after graduation?	32	21	48	30	17	53	28	17	55

M = 7, 6, 5 More than Proud/Likely; P/L = 4 Proud/Likely; L = 3, 2, 1 Less than Proud/Likely

The data below suggest that seniors felt more connected with individuals with whom they shared a common interest, e.g., major department and clubs rather than larger groups.

9. Connectedness									
	2004			2005			2006		
How connected do you feel to the following?	M	S	L	M	S	L	M	S	L
The department of your major	59	16	23	60	16	24	62	12	25
A particular faculty member	55	17	29	48	16	36	56	13	32
Particular clubs that you have joined	53	12	35	57	14	28	54	15	31
Your particular graduating class	41	17	42	38	15	47	41	16	42
Your residence hall or apartment neighbors	51	10	40	45	13	43	40	13	47
The university as a whole	39	22	38	37	25	38	36	23	40
UConn athletic teams	37	8	54	48	16	36	36	11	53
The undergraduate student body	25	23	52	25	26	49	28	21	52

M = 7, 6, 5 More than Satisfied; S = 4 Satisfied; L = 3, 2, 1 Less than

Here are a few summary observations:

1. UConn students indicate that they are generally satisfied with academic advising but that there is room for improvement.
2. Mixed responses to satisfaction with course availability reinforce the value of current efforts to optimize opportunities.
3. Survey findings show that 80% of seniors expected to graduate in four years when they entered UConn. The most recent four-year graduation rate was 56%.
4. Three of four seniors would choose UConn if they had to do it over again and recommend UConn to others.
5. Seniors indicated ease in making friends and getting involved in campus life but mixed responses with regard to being treated by the university like a person and not a number.
6. Seniors indicated a greater level of connectedness to smaller groups on campus than to larger groups and the University as a whole.
7. Students expressed pride in being a graduate of the University but little indication of active alumni involvement in the future.

Nominating Committee Report

to the University Senate

February 2, 2009

1. We move the following faculty deletion from the named standing committee:

   Cora Lynn Deibler from the Student Welfare Committee

2. We move the appoint Cora Lynn Deibler to Chair the Diversity Committee effective immediately through June 30, 2009.

3. We move to the following faculty and staff additions to the Diversity Committee effective immediately through June 30, 2009:

   Karen Bresciano as representative from the Growth & Development Committee
   Anne Hiskes
   Donna Korbel
   Joan Letendre as representative from the Student Welfare Committee
   Sue Lipsky as representative from the University Budget Committee
   Cathleen Love
   Margo Machida
   Maria Martinez
   Dana McGee as an ex-officio, non-voting representative of the President's Office
   Sally Neal
   Elizabeth Omara-Otunnu
   Isaac Ortega as representative from the Curricula & Courses Committee
   Mayté C. Pérez-Franco
   Catherine Ross
   Gaye Tuchman as representative from the Faculty Standards Committee
   Susana Ulloa as representative from the Enrollment Committee
   Steven Zinn

4. We move the following student deletions from the named committees:

   Krista D'Amelio, undergraduate, from the Growth & Development Committee
   Christopher Ferraro, undergraduate, from the Budget Committee

5. We move the following student additions to the named committees:

   Wonchi Ju, undergraduate, to the Diversity Committee
   Janna Mahfoud, graduate, to the Diversity Committee
   Clive Donald Richards, undergraduate, to the Budget Committee

Annual Report of the Senate Scholastic Standards Committee
February 2008-January 2009

Committee Charge: "This committee shall prepare legislation within the jurisdiction of the Senate concerning those scholastic matters affecting the University as a whole, and not assigned to the Curricula and Courses Committee, including special academic programs, the marking system, scholarship standards, and the like. It shall make an annual report at the February meeting for the Senate. This committee shall include two undergraduate students and one graduate student. " (By-Laws, Rules and Regulations of the University Senate).

The Senate Scholastic Standards Committee (SSSC) meets once or twice each month during the academic year. Business was completed on:

INTD Courses. The SSSC presented a motion to revise the procedures for reviewing and administering INTD courses whereby INTD courses would be re-categorized into INTD and UNIV and a University Interdisciplinary Course Committee would be established to replace the existing INTD C & C committee. The motion passed.

Academic Misconduct. The SSSC presented a report, then a motion to revise Sect II. E. 13 of the By-Laws of the Senate regarding *Cheating – Student academic Misconduct*. The motion carried.

Part-time students on Dean's List. The SSSC moved that part-time students be eligible for an annual dean's list using criteria for full-time students on a semester basis. The motion passed.

Honor's Program. Lynne Goodstein reported to the SSSC regarding the past, ongoing and planned future changes to the Honors Program.

Other business currently under discussion:

Academic Integrity Statement. To be brought to the Feb 2, 2009 senate meeting.

Missed Course activities Due to Religious Holidays. To be brought to the Feb 2, 2009 senate meeting.

Dismissal Policy. Addressing discrepancies between Senate By-Laws, e-Policy web page, and actual practice.

Academic Calendar. Issues regarding Reading Days and other issues submitted to a SEC task force.

Completion of Incomplete and Absent Grades. To correct discrepancy in By-Laws in response to Senate action.

INTD/UNIV Courses. Resolving By-Laws interpretations regarding review and administration of INTD/UNIV Courses.

Respectfully submitted,
Current Committee:

Diane Lillo-Marin, Chair (fall 2008)
John Clausen, Chair (spring 2009)
John Bennett
Kay Bloomberg
Scott Brown
Francine DeFranco
Gerald Gianutsos
Lynne Goodstein
Lawrence Gramling
Douglas Hamilton
Katrina Higgins
Janna Mahfoud
Yuhang Rong
Jeffery von Munkwitz-Smith
David Wagner
Han Zhang

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
Senate Scholastic Standards Committee

Proposal to amend the Student Code

Feb. 2, 2009

Background
The definition of Academic Integrity included in Appendix A of The Student Code was adopted from the Graduate School. SSSC proposes to replace this definition with the following statement to underscore the importance of academic integrity in undergraduate education.

Current Wording
Cheating - Student Academic Misconduct
Academic misconduct is dishonest or unethical academic behavior that includes, but is not limited, to misrepresenting mastery in an academic area (e.g., cheating), intentionally or knowingly failing to properly credit information, research or ideas to their rightful originators or representing such information, research or ideas as your own (e.g., plagiarism).

Motion
To adopt the following statement and recommend that it replace the current definition of Cheating in the Student Code.

Academic Integrity in Undergraduate Education and Research

This part of *The Student Code* describes the types of acts that shall be considered academic misconduct by undergraduates, and it presents the process for imposing sanctions for such acts.

The procedures for investigating complaints and imposing sanctions for academic misconduct differ somewhat from those applied to other violations of *The Student Code.* However, a hearing on academic misconduct follows the general procedures set forth in Part IV of *The Student Code*.

A. Academic Integrity

A fundamental tenet of all educational communities is academic honesty; academic work depends upon respect for and acknowledgement of the research, ideas and intellectual property of others. When we express our ideas in class assignments, projects or exams, we need to trust that someone else will not take credit for them. Similarly, others need to trust that our words, data and ideas are our own. We find the intellectual property of others in textbooks, periodicals, newspapers, journals, solution manuals, dissertation abstracts, emails, the internet and other sources electronic or otherwise. Regardless of where we find information, protecting and acknowledging the rightful originators of intellectual property is vital to academic integrity.

B. Academic Misconduct

Academic misconduct includes but is not limited to intentionally or knowingly failing to properly credit information, research or ideas to their rightful originators or representing such information, research or ideas as your own. Knowing what constitutes academic misconduct is so important to an educational community that all students are encouraged to go to their advisors, instructors, counselors, or assistant deans of students whenever they need clarification. Students who commit acts of misconduct will be held accountable for the violation and will be subject to the sanctions and other remedies described in *The Student Code*.

C. Examples of Academic Misconduct

The following examples of academic misconduct are illustrative rather than inclusive; therefore, this is not an exhaustive list:

Complicity - Helping or attempting to help another student commit an act of academic misconduct.

Cheating – Attempting to deceive by misrepresenting mastery in an academic area. This includes but is not limited to:
●Copying answers, text, or other information from exams, assignments, solutions manuals, publications, web sites, or other sources and presenting it/them as your own;
●Participating in unauthorized collaborations on labs, homework, take-home exams, etc.;
●Use or attempted use of any resources or devices that have not been approved by the instructor. These may include the unauthorized use of books, literature, notes, study aids, calculators, conversations, emails, earphones, PDAs, cell phones, pagers, cameras, or other means that are not authorized by the instructor on exams, homework, projects, and other assignments.
●Using the data or ideas of others from archived assignments from past courses, paper-writing services, or soliciting others to carry out an assignment on your behalf and presenting it as your own without authorization by the instructor and/or without fully acknowledging the rightful originator.

Fabrication – Using invented data or information or falsifying research or other findings; this includes but is not limited to:
●Creating a false citation or acknowledgement of a direct or secondary source;
●Intentionally documenting a source incorrectly;
●Padding the bibliography; that is, including in a bibliography or other list of references a citation that was not used to prepare the assignment;
●Including any invented and/or manipulated data or information;
●Deleting or distorting data or information in such a way as to skew its interpretation or conceal its origin;
●Submitting an assignment (or parts thereof) prepared by another without attribution.

Plagiarism - Presenting as one's own the published or unpublished ideas, data, words, or works of another that includes but is not limited to:
●Failing to properly attribute or acknowledge reproduced text or dialogue;
●Paraphrasing text or dialogue of another without proper attribution;
●Failing to provide complete and accurate recognition for the ideas, opinions, theories and other intellectual matter taken from others;
●Using data, facts, and/or other information that falls outside of the realm of common knowledge without proper attribution in the form of direct credit, footnotes, end notes or bibliography.

Other Examples of Academic Misconduct or Dishonesty include but are not limited to:
●Attempting to improperly influence any member of the university community via gifting, bribery, threats or other means;
●Presenting the same or substantially the same assignment without the authorization or knowledge of the instructor(s) in order to receive credit in two or more courses or academic areas;
●Falsifying the endorsement or approval of any member of the university community or the greater academic community;
●Altering, without authorization, an assignment, examination, grade, transcript, computer file, etc;
●Conducting unauthorized academic work for which another person will receive credit or be evaluated;
●Attempting to gain or gaining unauthorized access to restricted course resources;
●Selling or distributing restricted course resources;
●Misrepresenting your participation in a course;

Portions of this document been adapted from the web resources of:
►Princeton University Trustees, "Academic Integrity at Princeton", 2003: http://www.princeton.edu/pr/pub/integrity/
►University of Delaware Code of Conduct: http://www.udel.edu/judicialaffairs/ai.html
►University of Maryland Student Honor Council: http://www.testudo.umd.edu/soc/dishonesty.html

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
Senate Scholastic Standards Committee

Statement on class activities during religious holidays

Feb. 2, 2009

Background
It is often difficult for students when exams and other in-class activities are scheduled on religious holidays. However, it is not practical to ask instructors to avoid scheduling activities on religious holidays, as a full list of such holidays would exclude almost all class times. Therefore, the SSC recommends that instructors be urged to make reasonable accommodations for missed work.

A similar statement is issued regarding class activities missed due to university-sanctioned extra-curricular / co-curricular activities. This proposal has a different basis but a similar appeal to instructors for their reasonable accommodations.

Motion
The Senate recommends that the Provost send the following message to Deans, Directors, Department Heads, Faculty and Staff prior to the start of each semester.

Statement on class activities during religious holidays

Instructors are strongly encouraged to make reasonable accommodations in response to student requests to complete work missed by absence resulting from observation of religious holidays. Such accommodations should be made in ways that do not dilute or preclude the requirements or learning outcomes for the course. Students anticipating such a conflict should inform their instructor in writing within the first three weeks of the semester, and prior to the anticipated absence, and should take the initiative to work out with the instructor a schedule for making up missed work.

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
Senate Scholastic Standards Committee

Proposal to amend the By-laws

Feb. 2, 2009

Background

- In November 2007 the Senate passed a motion presented by the Scholastic Standards Committee to change the bylaws (II.E.6) to remove the words “in which they are enrolled” from the section on “Grades of Incomplete and Absent”. See item #9 in minutes and attachment #18: http://senate.uconn.edu/SenMin/senmin.20071112.pdf

  The approved change to the bylaws relates only to II.E.6. Unfortunately, section II.E.3. also refers to “the subsequent semester in which a student is enrolled.” The words “next semester” should replace the phrase, “subsequent semester in which a student is enrolled”.

- The same section of the by-laws also includes reference to bracketing of the GPA on student transcripts when temporary grades are assigned. This practice is no longer followed and so the wording should be deleted.

Motion
By-laws section II.E.3 shall be changed as follows:
(Deleted items in ~~strikethrough~~; new language in **bold)**

3. Undergraduate Grades
Undergraduate grading shall be done according to a letter system in which A and A- shall represent excellent work; B+, B, and B-, very good to good; C+, C, and C-, average to fair; D+, D, and D-, poor to merely passing; F, failure; I for incomplete; X for absent from semester examination (see II.E.6 below); AUD for course auditors (see II.B.6). With the approval of the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee, courses may be graded S to represent satisfactory work or U, unsatisfactory work. These courses may or may not award credit, but in neither case will grade points be awarded. With the approval of the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee, courses may be graded Y to identify non-semester related courses. When such a course is completed, a standard letter grade will replace the Y grade. If the course is not completed, the assignment of a semester grade shall be at the discretion of the instructor and the dean of the student's school or college. The letter N is used when an instructor does not submit a grade for a particular student. Temporary grades I, X, N, Y shall not suppress the calculation of either the semester or the cumulative grade point average~~; however in such cases, the grade point average will be bracketed on the academic record~~.

N and Y temporary grades are replaced on the academic record by the actual grade when submitted by the instructor. Work to convert I, N, X temporary grades to permanent grades must be completed by the end of the third week of the **next semester** ~~subsequent semester in which a student is enrolled~~. An N grade which remains unresolved will become N F and be computed as an F. If no grade is submitted for a grade of X, the grade will automatically revert to F and will be shown as X F.

If no grade is submitted to replace the grade of I, the automatic F will be shown as I F.

The following grade points per credit shall be assigned to grades: A, 4.0; A-, 3.7; B+, 3.3; B, 3.0; B-, 2.7; C+, 2.3; C, 2.0; C-, 1.7; D+, 1.3; D, 1.0; D-, 0.7; F, 0.

No student who has failed in a course shall have further opportunity to receive credit in that course except by repeating the work.

In all non-credit courses students shall be reported as passed "P" or failed "F".

Faculty Standards Committee Report
to the University Senate
February 2, 2009

Proposed Motion: Including Patents in the PTR Form

The Faculty Standards Committee would like to make the following motion to include patents in the PTR Form:

B. SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS (including art exhibits, musical compositions, and/or dramatic productions). All listed items should be in reverse chronological order.

1. Briefly (suggested length 300-500 words) outline your scholarly/creative goals for the next 5 to 10 years and the activities you have initiated to achieve them.

2. Scholarly/Creative Record. Provide full citations of your ***published*** work in the standard entry form used in your field for the categories listed below. Each citation should include a complete list of authors and pagination. (*Do not include work in progress, submitted for publication, or in press*).
   a. Books, Monographs
   b. Book Chapters
   c. Textbooks
   d. Refereed Journal Articles
   e. Conference Proceedings
      - Full length papers
      - Abstracts
   f. Miscellaneous Publications (including reviews, technical articles, and non-refereed journal articles)
   g. Exhibits, Performances, Curatorial Activity
   h. Awarded Patents

3. List published reviews of your scholarly work or creative accomplishments. (If available, attach copies as an appropriately labeled Appendix.)

4. List unpublished or unreleased work (including where it was submitted/accepted).
   a. Now accepted or in press (attach acceptance letter as an appropriately labeled Appendix).
   b. Submitted for publication or dissemination (with date of submission).
   c. Pending Patents

5. List creative works or manuscripts currently under preparation. (If you wish work in progress to be part of your evaluation, tangible evidence of the work must be made available for review. Provide this as an appropriately labeled Appendix.)

University Senate Curricula and Courses Committee
Report to the Senate
February 2, 2009

I. The Curricula and Courses Committee presents the following motion to REVISE membership and voting rights on the General Education Oversight Committee in section II.C.2.d. - Oversight and Implementation of the General Education Requirements.

BACKGROUND:
The General Education Guidelines currently specify that the "Directors of the University W and Q Centers will also be given non-voting appointments to GEOC." The GEOC agrees that W and Q Center representation on the GEOC is important but argues that it need not always be the Director who must serve, but the Associate Director could serve in his/her place. The GEOC therefore recommends to change the language of the Guidelines to include Associate Directors of the W and Q Centers when the Directors of those Centers do not serve. It is understood that the W and Q Centers shall have ONE appointment each of either the Director OR the Associate Director.

According to the General Education Guidelines, W and Q Center Directors serve on the GEOC as non-voting ex-officio members. All other members, all of them co-chairs of GEOC subcommittees, are voting members. Whenever a W or Q Center representative is also co-chair of the respective GEOC subcommittee, s/he may currently not vote. This creates inequity among subcommittee co-chairs. The GEOC recommends the General Education Guidelines to be revised to allow W and Q Center representatives (the Directors or Associate Directors as outlined above), when they serve as co-chairs of a GEOC subcommittee, to retain voting rights. This change supports equity among GEOC subcommittee chairs and allows representatives of the Q or W Centers to vote in GEOC on matters discussed in their subcommittees and brought forth by these subcommittees to GEOC. When W and Q Center Directors or Associate Directors are not subcommittee chairs, they shall not have voting rights on the GEOC.

MOTION:
(Additions are in boldface):

d. *Oversight and Implementation*
"General Education Requirements will be overseen by a General Education Oversight Committee (GEOC), a faculty group appointed by the Senate and representative of the Schools and Colleges. The Committee also will have an undergraduate and graduate student representative. The GEOC shall be a subcommittee of the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee whose chair will serve as a non-voting member of GEOC. ~~The Directors of the University W and Q Centers will also be given non-voting appointments to GEOC~~. **Representatives, either the Director or the Associate Director, of each of the W and Q Centers, will also be given non-voting appointments to GEOC. When Q or W Center Directors or Associate Directors are GEOC subcommittee chairs, they shall retain voting rights in the GEOC.** The GEOC will monitor the General Education curriculum. The creation of a Senate-appointed committee recognizes the policy control of the Senate in matters relating to undergraduate education. This Committee will work in association with the Office of Undergraduate Education and Instruction because this office has University-wide responsibility for the health of undergraduate education and the fiscal resources to address emerging issues. Financial support for the activity of the GEOC will come from the Office of the Provost."

Respectfully Submitted by the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee.

Michael J. Darre, Keith Barker, Marianne Buck, Janice Clark, Dipti Dedhia, Andrew DePalma, Dean Hanink, Kathleen Labadorf, Susan Lyons, Maria Ana O'Donoghue, Morty Ortega, Dante Paolino, Eric Schultz